R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 713 JC 670 010

CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION--DELINEATION OF FUNCTIONS, COORDINATION, FINANCE, GENERAL EXTENSION CENTERS.

BY- RICHARDS, JOHN R. AND OTHERS
CALIFORNIA STATE COORD. COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUC.

REPORT NUMBER NUMBER-1005 PUB DATE JUL 63
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.80 43P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *CONTINUING EDUCATION CENTERS, *ADULT EDUCATION, *STATE PROGRAMS, ARTICULATION (PROGRAM), PROGRAM COORDINATION, HIGHER EDUCATION, STATE COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES, UNIVERSITY EXTENSION, CALIFORNIA,

TWO PRINCIPLES SHOULD GUIDE CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS--(1) EVERY OFFERING OF AN INSTITUTION DESIGNED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF ADULTS SHOULD REFLECT THE STRENGTHS AND CAPABILITIES OF THAT INSTITUTION, AND (2) EVERY CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD BE THOROUGHLY INTEGRATED WITH THE INSTRUCTIONAL DEPARTMENT OF THE CAMPUS INVOLVED. THE JUNIOR COLLEGES SHOULD (1) OFFER ALL LOWER-DIVISION COURSES WITHIN THEIR DISTRICTS, WITH CERTAIN SPECIFIC EXCEPTIONS, (2) OFFER NON-GRADED CLASSES EXCLUSIVELY OF A POST-HIGH SCHOOL CALIBER, UNLESS REQUESTED TO DO OTHERWISE BY THE LOCAL HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT, (3) HAVE CLEARCUT AND STRICT CRITERIA FOR GRADED CLASSES, AND (4) IMPLEMENT A MATRICULATION POLICY FOR ALL STUDENTS IN GRADED CLASSES. STATE COLLEGES SHOULD (1) OFFER AS NEEDED LOWER DIVISION, UPPER DIVISION, GRADUATE AND NONCREDIT COURSES ON THEIR CAMPUSES AND EXISTING EXTENSION CENTERS, (2) NOT OFFER LOWER DIVISION COURSES OFF THEIR CAMPUSES, (3) OFFER UPPER DIVISION CREDIT AND NONCREDIT COURSES AND GRADUATE COURSES DESIGNED PRIMARILY FOR TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, AND (4) OFFER EXTENSION OFF-CAMPUS COURSES ONLY IN THEIR NORMAL SERVICE AREAS. THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SHOULD (1) CONTINUE CURRENT PRACTICES ON ITS CAMPUSES AND EXTENSION CENTERS, (2) NOT OFFER LOWER DIVISION CREDIT COURSES OFF ITS CAMPUSES AND EXTENSION CENTERS, (3) OFFER OFF CAMPUS GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE COURSES EXCEPT TEACHER TRAINING, (4) BE THE SOLE AGENCY FOR CORRESPONDENCE COURSES. (WO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED015713

CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION

Delineation of Functions
Coordination
Finance
General Extension Centers

JC 670 010

COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER 1005
JULY 1963

The Council is composed of fifteen members representing the various segments of higher education and the general public.

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Representing the University of California:

GERALD H. HAGAR, Chairman of the Board of Regents
DR. DONALD H. McLAUGHLIN, Regent
DR. CLARK KERR, President of the University

Representing the California State Colleges:

LOUIS H. HEILBRON, Chairman of the Board of Trustees
JOHN E. CARR, Trustee
DR. GLENN S. DUMKE, Chancellor of the State Colleges

Representing the Public Junior Colleges:

RAYMOND J. DABA, Member, State Board of Education
MRS. ELEANORE D. NETTLE, Trustee of the College of San Mateo
STUART M. WHITE, President, Fresno City College

Representing the Private Colleges and Universities:

FATHER CHARLES S. CASASSA, President, Loyola University of Los Angeles
DR. ARTHUR G. COONS, President, Occidental College, and Vice President of the Council
DR. ROBERT WERT, Vice Provost, Stanford University

Representing the General Public:

WARREN M. CHRISTOPHER, Los Angeles, President of the Council
ANDREW F. KAY, Del Mar
BERT W. LEVIT, San Francisco

COUNCIL STAFF

JOHN R. RICHARDS, Director
RUSSELL W. BARTHELL, Associate Director—Finance and Facilities
WILLARD B. SPALDING, Associate Director—Educational Programs
KEITH SEXTON, Assistant Director
COURTLAND L. WASHBURN, Fiscal Specialist
J. CLAUDE SCHEUERMAN, Fiscal Specialist
FRANKLIN MATSLER, Facility Specialist
DAVID A. DUXBURY, Fiscal Analyst
JOHN M. SMART, Research Associate

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION

DELINEATION OF FUNCTIONS
COORDINATION
FINANCE
GENERAL EXTENSION CENTERS

A REPORT OF THE COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

SACRAMENTO AND SAN FRANCISCO
JULY 1963

PREFACE

In 1961 two legislative resolutions directed the Coordinating Council for Higher Education to make a study of adult education and extension operations of the University of California, the California State Colleges and the public Junior Colleges. The legislative directives, shown in Appendix A, further requested that the Council "propose methods to assure a greater degree of coordination at all levels among the participating institutions."

In addition, study of California's adult and extension education has been urged by a resolution of the Trustees of the California State Colleges adopted on May 12, 1961, and by spokesmen for the University of California.

In compliance with these requests the Council staff prepared the following report upon which the Council made its recommendations in two phases: delineation of function and coordination adopted December 19, 1962, and finance and the designation of general extension centers adopted June 25, 1963. The first portion of the report together with the recommendations adopted on the earlier date were forwarded to the Legislature in January 1963, and subsequently distributed generally.[1] The following pages include both portions of the Council's study.

This report deals with the programs and operations of adult or continuing education in California today (Section I). It proposes a greater delineation of the functions among the segments (Section II) and it sets forth a more effective and comprehensive system for coordinating the continuing education offerings and services of all segments of public education (Section III).

The finance of continuing education programs is then considered (Section IV), followed by a discussion of the subject of the establishment and designation of general extension centers (Section V). The report is concluded by a brief discussion of the future patterns of continuing education in California (Section VI).

At the present time the Council is proceeding with the establishment and organization of the recommended State Committee on Continuing Education. The activities of the Committee and the subject of continuing education will be reviewed periodically by the Council as the need is apparent.

The Council and its staff wishes to extend its appreciation to the many persons from the segments of higher education and the public high school adult programs who assisted in developing the findings and recommendations contained herein. Specifically, the persons who served on the study's survey team and technical committee must be accorded recognition. Their names are shown in Appendix B.

[1] *Continuing Education Programs in California Higher Education*, Part I (Delineation of Function and Coordination), No. 1002, February 1963.

CONTENTS

Preface ---- 3

Recommendations on Continuing Education Programs in California Higher Education ---- 7

Introduction ---- 11

Section I—Continuing Education Programs in California Today

University of California Extension

Extent of Offerings ---- 13
Location of Classes ---- 13
Characteristics of Students ---- 13
Admission to Extension ---- 13
Administration of University Extension ---- 14
Financing University Extension ---- 14

State College Extension

Extent of Offerings ---- 14
Location of Classes ---- 15
Characteristics of Students ---- 15
Admission to State College Extension ---- 15
Administration of State College Extension ---- 15
Financing State College Extension ---- 16

Junior College Continuing Education

Extent of Offerings ---- 16
Location of Offerings ---- 16
Characteristics of Students ---- 16
Admission and Administration ---- 17
Financing Junior College Continuing Education ---- 17

High School Adult Education Programs ---- 17

Conclusions ---- 17

Section II—Delineation of Functions in Continuing Education

Consideration of Competition ---- 19
Responsibilities of the Council ---- 20
Allocation of Functions ---- 20

Section III—Coordination of Continuing Education in California

Coordination in the Past ---- 22
Coordination for Today and Tomorrow ---- 22
Recommendations ---- 23

Section IV—Finance of Continuing Education Programs

Junior Colleges

Current State Financial Support for Junior College Current Operations ---- 25
State Support for Adult and Minor Average Daily Attendance in 1961-62 ---- 25
Implications of the Definition of Adults ---- 26
Requirement for Change ---- 26
The Impact of Changes ---- 27
Criteria for Junior College Graded Classes ---- 27
Summary ---- 28
Recommendations ---- 28

CONTENTS—Continued

State Colleges
- Costs of Programs ---- 28
- General Considerations ---- 28
- Recommendations ---- 29

University Extension
- Costs of University Extension and Extent of State Support ---- 29
- The Concept of Ready-to-Serve Costs and State Support for University Extension ---- 30
- Considerations for Increased State Support ---- 31
- Determining the Proper Level of State Support ---- 31
- Recommendations ---- 32

Section V—Designation of General Extension Centers
- Present Facilities ---- 33
- Designation of Additional Centers ---- 33
- Facilities for Extension ---- 34
- University Extension Proposals for Sunnyvale ---- 34
- Recommendations ---- 35

Section VI—Conclusion
- Recommendations ---- 37

TABLES IN TEXT

Table 1—Average Daily Attendance by Type of Class and Students, Cost, and State Support—Junior Colleges 1961-1962 ---- 26

Table 2—University Extension: Budgets and Extent of State Support ---- 29

Table 3—University Extension: Detail of Administrative and Planning Costs ---- 30

Table 4—University Extension: Programs and Registrations ---- 31

Table 5—University Extension: Cancellation of Programs ---- 31

APPENDICES

Appendix A—Legislative Directives ---- 41

Appendix B—Survey Team and Technical Committee Members ---- 41

Appendix C—Junior College Graded Class Criteria ---- 43

Appendix D—Table 1 Average Daily Attendance and State Support by Type of Students: Junior Colleges—1961-62 ---- 44

Table 2 Average Daily Attendance, State Support and Current Expense by Type of Class; Junior Colleges—1961-62 ---- 44

Appendix E—Off Campus Extension Locations: California State Colleges and University of California ---- 45

RECOMMENDATIONS ON CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION

DIFFERENTIATION OF FUNCTION[1]

Allocation of Functions

Two general principles should guide all continuing education programs in the State:

1. Every offering of an institution of higher education designed to meet the needs of adults, should reflect the strengths and capabilities of that particular institution.

2. Every continuing education program should be thoroughly integrated with the appropriate instructional department of the campus involved.

Junior Colleges

The Coordinating Council recommends that:

1. Junior Colleges be responsible for offering all lower division credit courses within their districts including transfer courses, technical-vocational courses, and general education courses except as provided below. Junior Colleges may also legally offer classes for adults or non-graded classes.

2. Junior Colleges offer non-graded classes exclusively of a post-high school calibre unless specifically requested to do otherwise by the chief administrative officer of the local high school district.

3. The State Board of Education, as directed by the Legislature, establish clear-cut and strict criteria for graded classes at the 13th and 14th grade level.[2]

4. Junior Colleges implement a matriculation policy for all students enrolling in graded classes which would, at a minimum, require a part-time student to enroll in the same manner as a full-time student, to submit transcripts of previous high school or college work, to see a counselor, and to have a planned and stated degree or certificate objective.

State Colleges

The Coordinating Council recommends that:

1. State College Extension Services offer as needed lower division, upper division, graduate and non-credit courses on their own campuses or existing extension centers.

2. State College Extension Services not offer lower division courses off their campuses except in exceptional situations, authorized by the State Committee on Continuing Education.

3. State College Extension Services offer as needed off their campuses credit and non-credit upper division courses; and graduate credit courses designed primarily for the education, improvement and training of teachers.

4. Off-campus extension courses be offered exclusively in the normal geographical area ordinarily served by a particular State College. A delineation of State College geographical service areas, particularly in metropolitan complexes, should be developed immediately by the State Colleges and approved by the State Committee on Continuing Education.

University of California

The Coordinating Council recommends that:

1. University of California Extension offer as needed lower division, upper division, graduate, postgraduate, and non-credit courses on University campuses or existing extension centers.

2. University of California Extension not offer lower division credit courses off University campuses or extension centers, except in territory not within a Junior College district or within a Junior College district only after authorization by the State Committee on Continuing Education.

3. University of California Extension offer as needed off-campus courses, both credit and non-credit, in upper division, graduate, and postgraduate work, with the exception of graduate courses designed primarily for the education, improvement and training of teachers. This latter function is a major responsibility of the California State Colleges and University Extension should not offer courses in this subject field in the geographical areas normally served by State Colleges without the prior approval of the State Committee on Continuing Education.

4. University of California Extension should continue to be the exclusive agency for the offering of correspondence courses and for the sale and rental of educational films.

[1] Adopted by the Council, December 19, 1962.
[2] Criteria adopted subsequently.

COORDINATION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA[1]

The Coordinating Council recommends:

1. Appointment of a State Committee on Continuing Education to provide better coordination in the immediate future. The Committee should bear a relationship to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education as recommended in the *Master Plan for Higher Education.* The Committee should have the following membership appointed for two year terms in cases where the position is not the determinant:

a. Two representatives from the University of California to be appointed by the President. Representation should include the Statewide Dean of University Extension and one other University representative.

b. Two representatives from the California State Colleges to be appointed by the Chancellor. Representation should include the individual responsible for statewide coordination of the State Colleges' Extension programs, and one other State College representative.

c. Two representatives from the Junior Colleges: one representative from the State Department of Education to be appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and one representative to be appointed by the California Junior College Association.

d. Two representatives from the high school adult education field: one representative from the State Department of Education to be appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and one representative to be appointed by the Association of Adult Education Administrators.

e. One representative of the general public to be appointed by the Director of the Coordinating Council after consultation with the members representing the general public on the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

2. The State Committee on Continuing Education shall have the following functions:

a. Establish local or regional committees throughout the State wherever, in the opinion of the State Committee, a useful purpose will be served. In establishing such local committees, the State Committee shall designate the membership, develop regular meeting dates, and designate a local chairman for each committee. The chairman will be responsible for calling meetings and informing the State Committee of local Committee actions.

b. Hear and act upon all jurisdictional and functional disputes brought before it either by local committee, an individual segment, or the Committee's staff, and to report its decisions to the governing boards of the segments involved and to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

c. Design and direct means to gather adequate, comprehensive and comparable data on all aspects of continuing education in California.

d. Continually review the continuing education needs of adults in California and assess current programs in relation to those needs to determine if, in fact, the needs are being met. If they are not, the Committee should make appropriate recommendations to the governing boards of the segments and to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

e. Discuss and make recommendations to the governing boards and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education on any policy matters affecting continuing education in this State.

3. The Committee be provided a full-time executive secretary who will:

a. Be the permanent non-voting chairman of the Committee.

b. Be a member of the staff of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

c. Be appointed by the Director of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education upon the recommendation of the State Committee on Continuing Education.

4. The executive secretary shall have the following responsibilities:

a. Call regular or special meetings of the State Committee and prepare agendas and background materials for such meetings.

b. Maintain the permanent records of the State and local committees.

c. Ensure that local committees meet regularly and attend such meetings whenever possible.

d. Make personal surveys and investigations to determine that agreements between the segments are being implemented.

e. Mediate local disputes whenever possible.

f. Perform other staff and research work as is appropriate to the functions of the State Committee.

g. Prepare the Committee's annual report to the governing boards of the segments and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, together with such observations and recommendations as seem appropriate.

[1] Adopted by the Council, December 19, 1962.

5. So that continuing education credit offerings may be coordinated, the University Extension and the State College Extension Services shall submit, in advance, to the State Committee the credit offerings contemplated off their campuses. The State Committee shall determine the precise dates in the spring and fall when such information shall be submitted. Furthermore, the State Committee shall distribute relevant information collected to the appropriate local committees.

FINANCE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS[1]

Junior Colleges

The Coordinating Council recommends that:

1. In view of the interrelationship of the financing of continuing education programs to the whole of Junior College finance and in view of the fact that the impact of criteria for graded classes and matriculation requirements is not now apparent, no changes be made in support for adult students unless considered in reference to the whole of Junior College finance and at a time when the impact of criteria for graded classes and matriculation may be adequately assessed.

2. The study of the Junior Colleges and their finance approved by the Council on February 19, 1963, may provide the vehicle through which recommendations can be made for the financing of continuing education programs at the Junior Colleges.

State Colleges

The Coordinating Council recommends that:

1. In view of the character, organization, and stated objectives of State Colleges extension programs, such programs be supported by student fees.

2. The State Colleges immediately institute comprehensive, uniform accounting systems and procedures on all campuses to determine direct and indirect costs of all extension operations to insure that all costs attributable to extension are charged against the extension budgets.

3. Every effort be made to assure that the accounting systems and procedures of the State Colleges' Extension Services and the University Extension are as directly comparable as possible, and that both provide the data needed for analysis to the State Committee on Continuing Education.

4. The Trustees of the California State Colleges should be permitted to retain surpluses developed in the operation of the various State College extension programs; such funds to be apportioned on a statewide basis to areas of greatest need.

University of California

The Coordinating Council recommends that:

1. In view of the scope, purpose and role of University Extension, State support should be accorded to University Extension for those functions directly related to maintenance of the unique statewide character of Extension programs. Costs to be borne by the State should bear a relationship to the overall Extension budget substantially similar to that obtaining in the 1962-63 Budget. The balance of costs not supported by the State shall be supported through fees charged students.

2. University Extension immediately institute comprehensive, uniform accounting systems and procedures to determine direct and indirect costs of all Extension operations to insure that all costs attributable to Extension are charged to the statewide Extension budget.

3. Every effort be made to assure that the accounting systems and procedures of University Extension and the State Colleges' Extension Services are as directly comparable as possible, and that both provide the data needed for analysis to the State Committee on Continuing Education.

DESIGNATION OF GENERAL EXTENSION CENTERS[1]

The Coordinating Council recommends that:

1. Those locations where a full range of extension programs may be offered in accordance with recommendations on delineation of functions, be designated as "general extension centers" to distinguish them from other locations wherein several courses are offered.

2. The San Francisco State College Extension Downtown Center be designated a general extension center for purposes of offering a full range of extension programs; for University Extension, the Hillstreet Extension Center in Los Angeles and the San Francisco Center be likewise designated general extension centers.

3. Proposals to establish or upgrade any other locations to general extension centers be studied by the State Committee on Continuing Education and the results of those studies presented to the Coordinating Council for appropriate action.

[1] Adopted by the Council, June 25, 1963.

[1] Adopted by the Council, June 25, 1963.

CONCLUSIONS[1]

The Coordinating Council recommends that:

1. A re-examination of the continuing education programs of public higher education and the coordinating machinery recommended by this report be made by June 1965 by the State Committee on Continuing Education. Such examination should determine if adequate progress toward creating orderly, efficient and coordinated programs has been made in terms of the general needs for continuing education programs at the higher education level.

2. Should results of the study so indicate, the Coordinating Council make additional recommendations concerning function, coordination machinery and finance as may be required.

[1] Adopted by the Council, June 25, 1963.

INTRODUCTION

The adult in modern society faces the future with concern. Everywhere, new knowledge threatens to make his past training obsolete and his present knowledge inadequate. This report is concerned with continuing education for adults as it involves California's institutions of public higher education.

Because of the complexities and variations in our tripartite system of higher education the often-used term, adult education, encompasses a wide assortment of offerings, approaches, philosophical views, terminologies, and administrative procedures. In delineating the programs of adults for higher education, the broadest possible definition of adult education is used and this is best described by the term, *continuing education.*

The California adult receives continuing educational opportunities in many forms. Industry, business, and labor have vast training projects. Private and civic organizations, professional groups, the military, and government at all levels have instituted ongoing educational programs.

California, which first offered instruction to adults in 1891, is fortunate to have so many individuals, agencies, and groups helping to meet the current educational needs of adults. Yet it is a significant fact that many of these programs are tied directly to our institutions of higher learning.

California has profited from technological developments. It is a state wherein job opportunities are increasing rapidly. In 1962, California led all other states in the number of scientists working in its industries and universities, denoting the rapid rise of technology in the state. Yet a healthy, growing economy and further technological advances depend to some extent upon how successfully the adult working population can be upgraded, trained and retrained.

Many California adults see their present job demanding greater "know-how" and training. Old methods and past knowledge are no longer always sufficient. An employee in the electronics industry, for example, must stay abreast of new knowledge just to stay on the job. And, of course, promotion and salary increases often come only with additional training.

Included within upgrading programs is teacher training. Our teachers are the foundation upon which we erect our educational system, and their continued improvement is of vital concern. The teaching profession long ago recognized this and continuing education for teachers is accepted and often times required practice.

Other highly advanced professions have special needs for upgrading, too. Scientists require periodic "refreshers", as do physicians, dentists, engineers, architects, and lawyers.

While the need for upgrading of manpower is great, the need for training and retraining is even greater. It seems a tragic paradox that while so many unemployed persons seek work, there are so many jobs available.

Many of these unemployed persons were not trained in the first place to meet the technological needs of California's rapidly burgeoning industries. Many of them now desire and need the chance to continue their formal education.

Automation is revolutionizing agriculture, industry, and many service occupations. Machines and new production methods are replacing workers at an astounding rate. Many of these displaced workers lack the education and training to switch to other highly technical jobs. They have only inadequate training and experience to offer prospective employers. The displaced farm worker cannot become a skilled laboratory assistant overnight, if at all.

Economic results of continuing education opportunities often can be measured in terms of balance sheets, statistics, and employment data. In another realm, social progress and change, the effects of continuing education are somewhat more subtle, but nonetheless important to California's prosperity and stability.

If the California adult lives in a metropolitan area —and by 1975, 85% of them will—he is faced with a maze of complicated and interlocking problems. Personal and community decisions on delinquency, race relations, welfare, transportation, old age, public health, and education, to name only a few, all call for a knowledge which often bewilders the average citizen. If he resides in a rural area, he faces many of these problems and more besides—two important ones being his role in a rapidly urbanizing society and finding ways of holding on to worthy values from an agrarian past in an increasingly urbanized environment.

Increasing demands are being placed upon adult citizens as members of our democratic society. They are asked to think and to vote intelligently on a host of changing local, state, national and international issues. Beyond the economic, social, and political problems facing modern adults, there is a cultural area which too often is ignored. With appreciation of the

cultural side of man, the adult gains insights, judgments and feelings about his fellow men that are badly needed in a complex and changing world.

The vast and growing needs of our adult population call for some brief but significant observations on changes which are taking place, and will continue to take place, in California.

1. The adult population is growing.

California now leads the nation in population. The steady growth of recent years shows no sign of diminishing. In 1960, the population stood at 15,717,204; in 1962, more than 17 million. By 1975 it will be close to 25 million—a 37% increase over 1960.

While California's overall population is getting younger, the shifting makeup of the adult population during these next crucial years is significant. By 1970 the 25-64 age group will increase by 28%. Yet the over-65 age group will increase more rapidly—30.8% by 1970.

2. The educational level of adults is rising slowly.

The present and future educational levels of Californians have both encouraging and discouraging features.

Encouragingly, the median years of school completed by adults over 25 years of age jumped from 9.9 in 1940 to 12.1 in 1960, and will increase to an estimated 13.4 years in 1970. In addition, the percentage of California adults who have completed one or more years of college has risen steadily since 1940 when 15.3% of the adult population had completed one or more years of college. Twenty years later, in 1960, 23.2% of the adult population had completed one or more years of college.

The percentage of adults with four years of education or less has declined from 8.1% of the adult population in 1940 to 5.7% in 1960. These percentages, however, do not tell the entire story. In 1960, there were 164,332 adults who had completed *no* school years, and an additional 340,717 who had completed four years or less.

3. The occupation distribution is changing.

Between 1950 and 1960 the number of professional and technical workers increased 83%. Moreover, out of the total working population, the percentage of professional and technical workers increased from 11.1% to 14.1%.

The trend in California is toward an increased percentage of employees in service industries, and a relative decline of employees in the production industries. It is estimated that by 1980 only 34.1% of all employees will be in production industries, which include agriculture, mining, construction, and manufacturing. Service industry personnel, which includes trade, transportation, public utilities, finance, insurance, real estate, government and other services, will amount to 65.9% of the employed adult population. Many of these service occupations call for new and higher levels of individual preparation.

It is clear that from the standpoint of population growth, occupational distribution and equipment level, California's rapidly growing and changing society will require increased educational opportunities in the years to come. It is equally clear that if our predominantly urbanized society is to solve the multitude of social problems confronting it, that if agricultural regions are to become adjusted to the social change, and if all citizens, urban or rural, are to be politically responsible individuals, then institutions of higher learning must continue to help meet these challenges.

Fortunately, California has recognized that education can operate at many levels to keep pace with our changing and developing society. California, with its tripartite system of higher education and extensive public school system, has the potential to do the job. Requirements are so great that it will take the combined resources of all segments of education operating together in the best interests of the total society to meet the challenges ahead.

SECTION I

CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA TODAY

It is extremely difficult to compare current continuing education programs offered by the University of California Extension, the State College Extension Services, and the public Junior Colleges. There is a lack of uniformity in accounting practices and record-keeping procedures and in definitions of adult students, classes, and curricula. The problem of lack of adequate statistical information is reflected in this section of the report.

While a certain amount of variation is understandable, and desirable, one conclusion is self-evident: *If California is to have a coordinated effort in the field of continuing education, more uniform record-keeping, reporting and accounting procedures both within the segments and among the segments are of prime importance.*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EXTENSION

Extent of Offerings

During the 1961-62 academic year, University of California Extension reached the equivalent of 12,649 full-time students. These students had a choice of 4,772 programs of all types being offered by University Extension. Individual registrations totaled 184,-233. During the current year (1962-63) total registrations will be approximately 193,500, and the projection for 1963-64 is 205,500.

Roughly 50% of the 184,233 individual registrations in 1961-62 were for credit. University Extension operates primarily at the uper division and post-graduate level. Only about 14% of all credit classes are given in lower division, and a substantial number of these are given on University campuses or at established Extension centers.

In 1961-62, 1,266 upper division credit classes were offered comprising about 46% of all credit classes given by University Extension. Courses in business administration, engineering, liberal arts, and the physical sciences predominated. At the graduate-professional level 1,138 classes, about 40% of all credit offerings, were given. In addition, 197 short classes for credit, 58 credit conferences, and 227 credit correspondence courses were offered at all levels.

In non-credit programs, University Extension offered 729 classes, 200 short courses, 337 conferences, 123 discussion and lecture programs, and 112 non-credit correspondence courses.

Location of Classes

During 1961-62 Extension programs were offered in about 200 locations throughout the State. The great majority of registrations, however, were concentrated on University campuses and at the two existing Extension centers. For example, some 45,000 registrations were on the UCLA campus alone.

Sufficient information was not readily available to determine the numbers or kinds of programs offered in specific locations, nor was there information to indicate whether certain areas are being properly served.

Characteristics of Students

According to an Extension survey, approximately 90% of those in credit classes have had prior college work. This is an extremely important point in regard to judging types of programs presented by University Extension. A high proportion of college graduates calls for special types of programs. Likewise, the non-credit offerings attract students of a similar high educational level.

Men make up about two-thirds of the student population in Extension, and the median age for students in all classes, credit and non-credit, is thirty-three years.

In another survey conducted by University Extension, nearly two-thirds of the students who answered a questionnaire said that occupational advancement was their primary reason for attending Extension programs. It was found that the overwhelming majority of students attending both credit and non-credit Extension classes were employed in professional or semi-professional positions. Less than five percent of all Extension students seem to be in skilled, unskilled, or service worker categories.

Admission to Extension

Currently there is no admission requirement for attending either credit or non-credit Extension classes although individual classes may require prerequisites. Commencing in the fall of 1963, University of California admission standards will apply to all students who desire credit for Extension courses.

An individual may transfer up to nine hours of Extension work for graduate credit with the approval of the individual campus department. It is important

to note that a student can continue his graduate program to some extent through the Extension Division, especially in such fields as teacher education and engineering.

Theoretically, an individual may pursue three years of college work toward a bachelor's degree in Extension. However, course offerings are such that it is unlikely that a student would find sufficient courses in his major area to do this. Resident students may attend Extension classes providing approval has been obtained from their dean. Grade points earned in Extension, however, are not used in calculating averages for the full-time student's class standings.

Administration of University Extension

University Extension is administered on a statewide basis by the Director and a staff with offices in Berkeley and at UCLA. From these offices all Extension operations are coordinated through individual campuses and regional coordinators.

The approval of courses is jointly held by University Extension and the appropriate department at the nearest University campus. For example, a course in engineering in Los Angeles for undergraduate credit would require approval of the Engineering School at UCLA. Approval is required, as well, for non-credit offerings. Appointment of professors and instructors must also be approved by the appropriate department.

Compensation to instructors is based on a rate of $12.50 per hour for regular faculty and for non-faculty who have taught more than three years in Extension. Other instructors receive $10 per hour, although exceptions can be made to this scale.

Faculty employed by University Extension come from various sources—regular University faculty, State Colleges, Junior Colleges, other institutions and from non-educational fields. Examination of the faculty listed for the Los Angeles area for engineering courses for the fall of 1962 shows 88 of 179 faculty members as being employed by private firms and agencies, 69 as holding both a University appointment (usually as Instructor) as well as other jobs, and 22 being regular University faculty. In Education the pattern is similar: of 94 faculty members, 48 were employees of the public schools, 7 from the State Colleges, 5 from the Junior Colleges, 3 from private institutions, and 17 had occupations not directly associated with education. The remaining 14 were regular employees of the University. While these illustrations are of large operations requiring a considerable number of outside instructors, they do point up a pattern that regular University faculties *are often in a minority in Extension.* It is also clear that University Extension makes use of faculty members and teachers from all segments and levels of education.

Financing University Extension

During the 1962-63 fiscal year, University Extension will operate within a budget of more than $9,100,000. State support will total about 9% of operating expenses ($814,648). Income from student fees will provide the bulk of the financing with about $7,900,000 anticipated from this source.

With the exception of a few central services by University campus departments (such as, purchasing, accounting and personnel) administrative costs are contained within the University Extension budget. University Extension finances all rental, maintenance and utility costs of off-campus centers and off-campus classrooms.

Instructional costs, including teacher compensation, salaries of program planners and department expenses, have been determined to be about 71% of the total budget of Extension. Of this amount between 40-45% is estimated as being paid directly to teachers. Program and student services amount approximately to 12% of the expenditures while administrative costs for statewide and regional administration run slightly less than 7%. The balance of expenditures are channelled into special programs and maintenance of the physical plant. (The above percentages are based upon 1960-61 figures.)

For the three fiscal years 1959-60, 1960-61 and 1961-62, State support to University Extension has been limited to 9% of the total proposed budget. Prior to that time "ready-to-serve" costs were provided in an amount which generally averaged approximately 18%. Reduction of support in 1959 resulted in an increase in fees (currently an individual is charged $40 for a three-unit course), cancellation of some courses, and a reduction of many new and experimental offerings. Sequentially planned courses, such as foreign languages, suffered particularly because of the need to maintain larger class sizes which is difficult in the second or third year of such programs.

Cancellation of classes is a major problem because of limited enrollment. Over 16% of all credit and non-credit classes scheduled during 1961-62 were discontinued. It is significant to note, that a somewhat higher percentage of discontinuances occurred at the graduate level than at the lower division and upper division levels, and that non-credit classes had a higher percentage of discontinuance than credit classes.

STATE COLLEGE EXTENSION

Extent of Offerings

During the fall semester of 1962, State College Extension offered approximately 500 credit classes administered through 13 of the 15 State Colleges. For the full year, therefore, it may be assumed that there will be about 1,000 classes offered.

State College Extension is almost exclusively dedicated to upper division programs. Less than 4% of the courses offered in 1959-60 were in lower division.

Enrollments in State College Extension courses during the 1961-62 academic year exceeded 29,000. Neither the actual number of students nor the equivalent in full-time students is known. Enrollments of students and the number of non-credit offerings were not available.

Teacher education courses dominate the offerings of State College Extension. A survey of courses planned for fall 1962 shows more than 60% of the courses offered are designed expressly for teachers, and certainly a portion of other courses offered may be applicable for teacher salary schedule credit. The number of courses of interest and value to teachers probably approaches 80%.

A number of State Colleges present non-credit offerings which have as their purposes continuing education for adults. Some of these are presented through the college itself. In other institutions foundations are used as a means of financing and administering such institutes, workshops, conferences, short courses, etc., which comprise these non-credit offerings. These foundations are organized in many ways and usually operate the campus bookstore and cafeteria, hold and disburse scholarships and loans, and perform other functions. All are termed "auxiliary organizations" by the State, have signed lease agreements with the State, and are audited by State auditors. Some of the foundations have taken on the function of acting as fiscal administrators, and in a few cases as organizer of the short-term, non-credit offerings described above.

Data does not exist on the precise numbers and types of these programs. The Office of the Chancellor of the California State Colleges is undertaking to gather such data. It is hoped that certain rigidities of State fiscal administration which have kept the colleges from developing these programs as a regular part of their extension offerings may be removed.

Programs in State College Extension vary widely and are not merely reflective of the size and age of the institution. Cal Poly offers no extension from either of its campuses, nor does Long Beach State. The largest programs in extension are mounted by San Francisco State and San Jose State, with Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento, and Fresno having substantial programs as well. Minimal programs (less than 20 courses for fall 1962) are found at Orange, Stanislaus, San Fernando Valley, and Alameda County State Colleges.

Location of Classes

State College announcements for the fall of 1962 indicate that courses are presently offered in about 150 communities throughout the State. Enrollment by area was not available; however, it is apparent that the majority of offerings and attendance are concentrated to a great extent in or near population centers. It appears that the number of locations at which State College Extension courses are given has been growing smaller. For example, in 1959-60 classes were given at 180 locations. One reason for the reduction may be the opening of new campuses in some areas and the increased opportunity to obtain courses on campuses in the extended day program.

Only one college, San Francisco State, operates an Extension Center. A regular program in world business is found at the San Francisco Center, as well as extension offerings. Two other State Colleges have off-campus centers at which regular students are enrolled. These centers, Bakersfield and Imperial Valley, offer programs for persons seeking to complete requirements for elementary school credentials.

Characteristics of Students

Little is known concerning the characteristics of individuals enrolled in State College Extension programs. The large number of teacher education courses and corresponding enrollments, of course, indicate a group seeking professional training and advancement. Other groups and individuals are not identifiable through available data.

Admission to State College Extension

No admission requirements are placed upon registrants in State College Extension classes. Prerequisites exist for some classes and applicability of courses to degree programs at colleges is subject to the review of the individual college and its departments.

Up to 24 semester units may usually be earned in State College Extension for credit toward the baccalaureate degree and six units for the Master's degree. Some colleges allow lesser amounts. Counselling prior to registration is not required. However, students seeking transfer of credits to regular programs are generally directed to appropriate advisors.

Education is probably the only field in which an individual may partly pursue any organized program for a degree or certificate through his State College Extension work. Other offerings appear too minimal for a person to obtain any sort of sequential program in a given subject matter field.

Administration of State College Extension

State College Extension is almost completely decentralized with the Dean of Educational Services at each college in charge of the local program. Efforts at statewide coordination have only recently been initiated with the appointment of a Statewide Dean whose first task is to gather data necessary to improve internal coordination. The lack of previous statewide

coordination is in part responsible for the insufficient data available concerning programs offered and individuals served.

Courses are approved by the individual campus department concerned. Faculty appears to be recruited predominately from regular full-time instructors. For example, of 39 Los Angeles State Extension instructors in the fall of 1962, only 4 are not listed as regular faculty members. Compensation to State College Extension instructors is based upon hours and enrollments. An instructor for a three-unit class may receive from $384 to $705 per semester depending upon the number of enrollees.

Financing State College Extension

During the 1962-63 fiscal year, extension operations at the various State Colleges will operate within budgets totaling about $750,000. This figure excludes operations of the San Francisco State Downtown Center ($104,627). More than 80% of the extension budgets are expended for salaries and wages of instructors and administrative-clerical help. It is not apparent from available data the proportion of these budgets dedicated to development of new programs and special projects.

It is assumed from an overview of the State College Extension programs that little so-called "risk" money is available for the development of other than the conventional, proven programs. Whether or not budgetary considerations are the primary reasons for the apparent limited interest in more unique programs of continuing education by some State Colleges cannot be readily determined.

JUNIOR COLLEGE CONTINUING EDUCATION

Extent of Offerings

The scope of offerings within continuing education is not as easily determined for the Junior Colleges as in the two extension operations just discussed. Any possible lines of demarcation between the regular Junior College program and Junior College efforts in continuing education are obscured and confused by educational philosophies, methods of finance, reporting of data in terms of those methods of finance and the legal definition of adults.

Examination of Junior College continuing education programs might be pursued in one of two ways: in terms of whether the class is graded or non-graded, or in terms of the legal definition for apportionment purposes of an adult (21 years or older and taking less than 10 contact hours of work). Neither method, in itself, produces the data desired for this report. Therefore, an effort has been made to view the entire Junior College program with emphasis on its part-time aspects.

In the fall of 1961 a total of 135,464 of 305,201 Junior College students in graded classes were determined to be adults according to legal definition. This represented a reduction of 4.46% in the number of adults from the previous year, although overall enrollments in graded classes increased by 5.28%. Adults in non-graded classes amounted to slightly more than 60,000. Thus more than 194,000 legally defined adults were attending Junior College classes. In terms of ADA, the State Department of Education reports that in 1961 there were 165,450 units of regular ADA and 37,800 of adult ADA.

Junior College graded offerings appealing to adults reflect the basic purposes of the Junior Colleges: transfer, technical-vocational, general or liberal arts, remedial and community service. Subjects with the highest enrollments most generally found in the non-graded classes are business education, homemaking, fine arts, industrial education and agriculture, parent education and foreign languages. Lecture series, drama presentations, symphonies and other cultural events appear to be increasing at the Junior College level. Such activities are often financed through the community service tax.

Location of Offerings

All Junior Colleges are, in effect, engaged in continuing education. A few Junior Colleges offer no non-graded classes. The bulk of programs geared to the part-time student are offered on the individual campus, yet classes may be, and often are, presented at other locations in the college's district. Approval to offer classes in non-district territory must be secured from the State Board of Education.

Characteristics of Students

Very little is known on a statewide basis concerning the ages and objectives of the part-time students in the Junior Colleges either in graded or non-graded classes. Individual colleges have, however, conducted some studies which provide relevant data though these studies can be used only as illustrative.

For example, a survey of students enrolled in the Modesto evening program showed the highest number of individuals in graded classes to be in the 21-29 years age group (28.6%); 21.8% were 30-39 years; and 15.4% were 40-49 years. In non-graded classes 26.6% were in the 40-49 age group; 24.4% were 30-39, and 21.7% were 21-29. This same study found that women students tended to be older (average age 34), while men students averaged 30. Men, it was found, are more interested in the college credit program and tend to "complete" their training at an earlier age than women.

Another study of Junior College students in Contra Costa County in both categories of classes found like distributions: 39.6% were 21-30; 31.2% were 31-40, and 14.5% were 41-50.

The Modesto study indicates that about 17% of the students in both graded and non-graded classes had less than a high school education. The Contra Costa study shows only 8% as not having completed high school. 40.9% in graded classes and 32.7 in non-graded classes in Modesto had a high school diploma. 35.2% and 21.4%, respectively, had less than 2 years college. College graduation had been obtained by 6.3% of the students in graded classes and 12.5% in those that were non-graded.

Even less information is found concerning occupations and objectives. The Contra Costa study indicates the largest percentage, 42%, in the skilled and unskilled worker and service groupings, while professional, technical and managerial groups accounted for about 32%.

Admission and Administration

Junior Colleges follow the "open-door" policy of admission. Junior Colleges have a matriculation policy for their regular full-time students which involves, at a minimum, the forwarding of high school transcripts and the counselling of students. In some instances, as in Modesto, similar matriculation is required of *all* students including those registering in non-graded classes, although the high school transcript may not be required until the individual begins to pursue graded work.

Administrative organization of continuing education in Junior College programs varies greatly. Most Junior Colleges have separate deans for the evening and late afternoon programs. The tendency is to separate evening and late afternoon programs from those offered during the day even though there is considerable overlap in classes and students. This administrative division is undoubtedly caused partly by staffing needs for an 18 hour school day.

There is no data available to indicate the extent to which the evening program faculties differ from that of the day. In certain subjects, particularly technical fields, it is only possible to obtain qualified instructors on a part-time basis. Compensation paid to instructors is generally based upon an hourly rate, varying from college to college.

Financing Junior College Continuing Education

Financing of Junior College programs is a joint local and State effort with the bulk of the burden falling upon the local district. Under present laws each unit of ADA, whether adult or regular, means to the district at least $125 State aid (basic aid). For regular students, a foundation program has been established totaling $543 which is made up of the basic aid, plus the district effort and the balance (equalization) given by the State if the first two fail to reach the foundation program.

For the adult student as defined by law, the amount of State support is limited to $220. Thus, many districts on equalization aid receive less State money for adult ADA than for units of regular ADA. On a statewide average, the State provides about $140 per adult ADA to local Junior College districts.

Fees are seldom assessed adults attending Junior College classes even though legislation permits the assessment of such fees to all adults in non-graded classes except for classes in English and citizenship for the foreign-born and classes in elementary grade subjects. Of 52 Junior Colleges reporting in the fall of 1961, only 14 charged a fee which in no case was more than five dollars.

HIGH SCHOOL ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Adult education programs are offered in 146 evening high schools and evening junior colleges. Some adult classes are given in the 135 high school districts where such classes are attached administratively to day high schools. Offerings include elementary and high school subjects and classes not defined by specific grade levels.

The State Department of Education reports that enrollments in these programs totaled 436,108 in 1961. This total indicates that high school adult programs are larger in terms of total number of adult enrollees than any of the other three programs of continuing education. More than 11,000 persons earned elementary certificates and high school diplomas through the adult program during 1960-61.

In contrast with the programs in continuing education of the segments of public higher education, there is little difficulty in assigning the line of demarcation between continuing education and the regular program at the high school level. High school adult programs are generally administered separately and the clientele is easily identified.

CONCLUSIONS

University of California Extension

1. University of California Extension offers courses at all levels and of all kinds, but with particular interest and emphasis placed upon programs geared to the college educated and to the economic groups willing to pay substantial fees. University Extension cannot, therefore, be considered to be actually engaged in mass adult education either in terms of cost to the individual or courses offered.

2. University Extension, insofar as finances permit, is oriented toward the unusual in continuing education programs. It is of greatest benefit to the individual seeking the specialized or highly technical course or program and it is of benefit to those seeking sophisticated cultural and informational programs.

State College Extension

1. State College extension courses, administered in a decentralized manner, are primarily oriented toward teacher education and improvement. Most colleges do not mount considerable programs in subject matter areas.

2. Efforts beyond teacher education are presently limited.

Junior Colleges

California's adult population at all occupational and economic levels comprises the clientele of Junior College continuing education programs. In higher education, Junior Colleges are the most involved and responsive to the needs of the greatest portion of the population. In the programs presented by Junior Colleges and high schools are found the bulk of the persons seeking continuing education.

SECTION II

DELINEATION OF FUNCTIONS IN CONTINUING EDUCATION

In the years immediately ahead all the resources and talents of the segments of California higher education will be needed to meet the educational demands of regular full-time and part-time students and the needs of adults in continuing education programs.

California cannot afford to waste its educational resources. In increasing numbers high school graduates each year are pressing at the doors of our institutions of higher learning. Research and consulting activities are heavy competitors for the teaching talents of our college and university professors. As costs of education continue to rise, competition for the tax dollar will become even greater.

California has had a long tradition of providing educational opportunities to adults, albeit in a number of different forms as described in Section I. Until the late 1940's, continuing education for adults was provided primarily by the University of California Extension and by the adult education divisions of the local high schools. With the growth of the Junior College extended day offerings, and with the rapid increase in the number of higher educational institutions, continuing education programs have sometimes grown without proper planning, coordination, or equitable financial assistance.

Consideration of Competition

The legislative resolutions which initiated this study authorized the Council to investigate the degree and amount of "unfortunate and disturbing competition" in higher adult education among the segments.

At the outset it should be made clear that the same course offered in the same community at the same time by two different institutions of higher learning may not, in fact, be unwarranted duplication and competition. Although the same course title and description may be used, the courses may be designed for two different audiences with entirely different comprehension levels, work required, and educational objectives. The matter is not always as simple to determine as it might appear from a cursory glance at catalogues.

Competition can take a number of different forms: competition for faculty; competition for service areas; competition for dollars; competition for prestige and status, and competition to do a better job.

At the time the Legislature directed that this study be made, there was concern over unhealthy duplication and competition between State College extended day programs and University of California Extension courses. There was justification for this concern.

Matriculation requirements for limited students attending the State Colleges were first put into effect in the fall of 1960. This policy has not been fully implemented and when it has been fully accomplished, many of the grave doubts and concerns regarding competition and overlapping between State College extended day programs and University Extension should be eliminated. Other matters of concern regarding campus late afternoon and evening programs were deemed as matters of admission practices and policies which will be dealt with in more comprehensive and related reports.

Another concern of the Legislature dealt with unhealthy competition between some Junior College extended day programs and the offerings of some high school adult programs. While attempts have been made to resolve these problems on a statewide level it cannot be reported at this time that substantial progress has been accomplished.

The Junior Colleges are authorized by statute to offer both 13th and 14th year classes for adults (nongraded classes). From 1952-53 until recently, the tendency in most Junior Colleges has been to place more and more of the adult education classes in the graded category. Such actions have been motivated by a number of factors: (1) lack of any clear-cut, definitive, or useful set of criteria to determine what should appropriately be 13th or 14th year graded classes; (2) the desire for higher educational status and prestige; (3) financial advantages for some local districts resulting from higher levels of State aid for graded class enrollments, and (4) the desire of organizations and associations to upgrade their members.

Despite statements to the contrary there has been some unfortunate competition and duplication among the educational segments in the field of continuing education. Incomplete records, however, prevent full assessment of the extent of this competition. Although a number of illustrations throughout the state could be cited to justify this conclusion, it serves no purpose to single out specific areas or institutions.

Considering the vast and diverse programs of continuing education offered by California's four different segments of education, there is a minimal amount of unhealthy competition. However, even such minimal competition is not easily condoned when the job to be done requires every resource available. Further,

such competition is detrimental to the students who are supposed to be served, to the taxpayers supporting these programs, and to the reputations of all institutions of higher education when such incidents occur.

Responsibilities of the Council

What has been of great concern in this study is the threat of unwarranted competition in the future. California's higher educational systems are expanding both in size and numbers to meet the needs of a growing population. With increasing demands for public funds, California must be certain that continuing education opportunities for adults are available and that programs are justifiable, economical, and clearly allocated.

Several methods of guaranteeing the best possible programs with the least amount of unnecessary duplication have been considered. First, the possibility of dividing the state geographically into service areas, institution by institution, was considered. With the rapid growth of the state, the mobility of California's population, increasing urbanization, and the multiplication of institutions within metropolitan areas, a service area approach would be cumbersome, unwieldy, and unworkable.

Second, the possibility of allocating functions according to the occupational choices of the students was considered. Students, be they adults or teenagers, never fit into any rigid or easily defined mold. Therefore, allocation according to curricula is not feasible.

Third, the possibility was examined of combining the University and State College Extension systems and permitting Junior Colleges to continue their current programs. Such a system might be advantageous to avoid unnecessary duplication in the upper division, graduate-professional and non-credit programs; differentials in student fees would be eliminated, and greater coordination would be possible. While there is merit to a unified extension agency, there are disadvantages which at this time make such a combined system neither practical nor feasible. It is essential that extension credit services be closely associated with appropriate departments of instruction on each campus involved. Under a single system this would be more difficult because the two segments often would vary in attitude, interest, and administrative support to particular continuing education programs. Furthermore, creation of a large extension system carries with it the dangers of bureaucratic routine which might inhibit, if not kill, the vitality so essential to continuing education programs.

Even if State College and University Extension operations were molded into a single unified system, it would merely reduce continuing education administrative levels from four to three. Combining of Junior College and high school adult programs would be practically impossible. Consequently, a single system of continuing education for California citizens would not be achieved in any case.

While it is impossible, and undesirable, to impose rigid guidelines to meet every situation in a State as diversified as California, more careful definition of future functions to be performed by each segment can be made to make coordination of continuing education more feasible and enforceable.

The following recommendations will more clearly than ever before define and allocate the functions of each segment of higher education in the field of adult or extension offerings. The functions have been designed to build upon the past and present strengths of the segments' operations in order to provide for growth and expansion in an orderly and efficient pattern.

ALLOCATION OF FUNCTIONS

Two general principles should guide all continuing education programs in the State:

1. **Every offering of an institution of higher education designed to meet the needs of adults, should reflect the strengths and capabilities of that particular institution.**
2. **Every continuing education program should be thoroughly integrated with the appropriate instructional department of the campus involved.**

Junior Colleges

With respect to the functions of the public Junior Colleges in the field of continuing education the Coordinating Council recommends that:

1. **Junior Colleges be responsible for offering all lower division credit courses within their district including transfer courses, technical-vocational courses and general education courses except as provided below. Junior Colleges may also legally offer classes for adults or non-credit classes.**
2. **Junior Colleges offer non-graded classes exclusively of a post-high school calibre unless specifically requested to do otherwise by the chief administrative officer of the local high school district.**
   While this is not only sound educational policy, it is also essential in terms of campus capacities. Many junior college campuses are running at capacity or near capacity in their evening programs, while many high school and elementary school classrooms remain empty.
3. **The State Board of Education, as directed by the Legislature, establish clear-cut and strict criteria for graded classes at the 13th and 14th grade level.[1]**

[1] See Section IV for Discussion of Criteria adopted subsequent to date of this recommendation.

4. **Junior Colleges implement a matriculation policy for all students enrolling in graded classes which would, at a minimum, require a part-time student to enroll in the same manner as a full-time student, to submit transcripts of previous high school or college work, to see a counselor, and to have a planned and stated degree or certificate objective.**

   Such a policy would serve the student by: (1) assisting him in assessing his goals and capabilities, (2) helping him plan his program, (3) directing him into courses that fit his talents, (4) reducing the number of drop-outs, and (5) permitting students who have no planned degree or certificate objectives to be directed into non-credit offerings by one of the four segments.

State Colleges

With respect to the functions of the California State Colleges in the field of extension services the Coordinating Council recommends that:

1. **State College Extension Services offer as needed lower division, upper division, graduate and non-credit courses on their own campus or existing extension centers.**
2. **State College Extension Services not offer lower division courses off their campuses except in exceptional situations, authorized by the State Committee on Continuing Education.[1]**
3. **State College Extension Services offer as needed off their campuses credit and non-credit upper division courses; and graduate credit courses designed primarily for the education, improvement and training of teachers.**
4. **Off-campus extension courses be offered exclusively in the normal geographical area ordinarily served by a particular State College. A delineation of State College geographical service areas, particularly metropolitan complexes, should be developed immediately by the State Colleges and approved by the State Committee on Continuing Education.**

[1] State Committee on Continuing Education is described in Section III.

University of California

With respect to the functions of University of California Extension the Coordinating Council recommends that:

1. **University of California Extension offer as needed lower division, upper division, graduate, postgraduate, and non-credit courses on University campuses or existing extension centers.**
2. **University of California Extension not offer lower division credit courses off University campuses or extension centers, except in territory not within a Junior College district or within a Junior College district only after authorization by the State Committee on Continuing Education.**
3. **University of California Extension offer as needed off-campus courses, both credit and non-credit, in upper division, graduate, and postgraduate work, with the exception of graduate courses designed primarily for the education, improvement and training of teachers. This latter function is a major responsibility of of the California State Colleges and University Extension should not offer courses in this subject field in the geographical areas normally served by State Colleges without the prior approval of the State Committee on Continuing Education.**
4. **University of California Extension should continue to be the exclusive agency for the offering of correspondence courses and for the sale and rental of educational films.**

SECTION III

COORDINATION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

Coordination in the Past

In the past two decades there have been several attempts to coordinate continuing education programs of the University of California, the California State Colleges, the public Junior Colleges and the high schools. Some of these attempts have been relatively successful; others have not.

In 1944, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the President of the University of California appointed a State Advisory Committee on Adult Education. This committee met several times to explore the status and development of adult education in California and, after submitting a number of recommendations, concluded that its work was completed and held no further meetings.

The Strayer Committee Report in 1948 recommended that the Advisory Committee be resurrected. A Committee was reappointed and began operations in November, 1949. It continued to meet at intervals until January, 1953, when it asked to be discharged. In accordance with its request, the Committee was dissolved. A third Committee of eighteen members then was appointed; this is the current State Advisory Committee on Adult Education.

The present Committee is composed of three representatives each from the State Department of Education, the University of California, the California State Colleges, the Junior Colleges, the city and county school superintendents, and the evening high schools. As a result of recommendations contained in the Master Plan for Higher Education, one representative from Agricultural Extension and one from the private colleges and universities were added to the Committee.

Since its inception the State Advisory Committee has helped organize local coordinating committees, has developed guiding principles for use by local groups and institutions, discussed problems, and acted as a technical committee first to the Master Plan Survey Team and most recently to the Coordinating Council.

At the time the current Advisory Committee was appointed, the President of the University and the State Superintendent appointed a two-man team to make field visits in order to eliminate problems of conflict and duplication which might arise. In order that immediate resolution of such problems might take place, the team was directed to establish local committees to review all program requests and proposals. On the basis of such reviews, the local committee was to allocate programs to the appropriate agency. Such allocation was to be accepted as final, although in cases where there was disagreement the State Advisory Committee would hear an appeal.

Currently, local committees appear to exist, or recently existed, in Fullerton, Sacramento, San Diego, San Jose, San Francisco, the Tri-County area (San Bernardino-Riverside-East Los Angeles) and Los Angeles.

Coordination for Today and Tomorrow

The preceding section sets forth guidelines for the appropriate functions of each segment in the field of continuing education. Such guidelines, if implemented, will correct many of the competitive situations which have arisen in the past.

One of the most crucial questions considered in this study was whether the existing State Advisory Committee on Adult Education, using the recommended guidelines, would be sufficient to coordinate continuing education programs of all segments. The conclusion has been reached that it would not be sufficient to do the job. Accordingly, the Council recommends a major change in coordination of higher adult education offerings in California.

Although the State Advisory Committee on Adult Education has performed valuable functions, it has been unable (or seldom called upon) to resolve local disputes among the segments when they arose. Furthermore, the Committee has had little success in handling major policy decisions which are customarily of a controversial nature.

There are reasons for the Committee's inadequacies. Because of lack of staff assistance, the Committee has been unable to collect and to interpret pertinent information on current adult programs in the State. For example, the Committee has not been able to devise annual reporting procedures for the various segments to provide a minimum of comparable data required to make policy decisions.

In addition, functions and responsibilities of the Committee have never been clearly delineated. The Committee has been unable to resolve disputes because of limited administrative mandates. Each segment has guarded its own autonomy so closely that cooperation has been difficult. Membership and changes have inhibited continuity. The chairmanship of the Commit-

tee has rotated annually, and Committee records have never been in one central location. The membership of the Committee has been too large to be effective. Moreover, representation has been unevenly distributed among the segments. Lastly, meetings of the Committee have been too infrequent.

The establishment and operation of most local committees have also proven inadequate. They are designed to resolve problems at the local levels. When they could not, the unresolved problems were to be forwarded to the State Advisory Committee. The minutes of the State Advisory Committee show little direct contact with these local committees. Local committees that do exist meet irregularly. They have been no more successful in solving major policy conflicts among the segments than the State Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Coordinating Council, therefore, recommends:

1. Appointment of a State Committee on Continuing Education to provide better coordination in the immediate future. The Committee should bear a relationship to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education as recommended in the Master Plan for Higher Education.[1] The Committee should have the following membership appointed for two year terms in cases where the position is not the determinant:

a. Two representatives from the University of California to be appointed by the President. Representation should include the Statewide Dean of University Extension and one other University representative.

b. Two representatives from the California State Colleges to be appointed by the Chancellor. Representation should include the individual responsible for statewide coordination of the State Colleges' Extension programs, and one other State College representative.

c. Two representatives from the Junior Colleges: one representative from the State Department of Education to be appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and one representative to be appointed by the California Junior College Association.

d. Two representatives from the high school adult education field: one representative from the State Department of Education to be appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and one representative to be appointed by the Association of Adult Education Administrators.

e. One representative of the general public to be appointed by the Director of the Coordinating Council after consultation with the members representing the general public on the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

2. The State Committee on Continuing Education shall have the following functions:

a. Establish local or regional committees throughout the State whenever, in the opinion of the State Committee a useful purpose will be served. In establishing such local committees, the State Committee shall designate the membership, develop regular meeting dates, and and designate a local chairman for each committee. The chairman will be responsible for calling meetings and informing the State Committee of local Committee actions.

b. Hear and act upon all jurisdictional and functional disputes brought before it either by a local committee, an individual segment, or the Committee's staff, and to report its decisions to the governing boards of the segments involved and to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

c. Design and direct means to gather adequate, comprehensive and comparable data on all aspects of continuing education in California.

d. Continually review the continuing education needs of adults in California and assess current programs in relation to those needs to determine if, in fact, the needs are being met. If they are not, the Committee should make appropriate recommendations to the governing boards of the segments and to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

e. Discuss and make recommendations to the governing boards and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education on any policy matters affecting continuing education in this State.

3. The Committee be provided a full-time executive secretary who will:

a. Be the permanent non-voting chairman of the Committee.

b. Be a member of the staff of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

c. Be appointed by the Director of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education upon the recommendation of the State Committee on Continuing Education.

4. The executive secretary shall have the following responsibilities:

a. Call regular or special meetings of the State Committee and prepare agendas and background materials for such meetings.

---

[1] "The existing State Advisory Committee on Adult Education be responsible to the co-ordinating agency and continue the responsibilities delegated to it by action of the State Board of Education and The Regents of the University of California in 1952. Furthermore, that the co-ordinating agency, to which the Committee will annually report and to which it will make its recommendations, provide the Committee with necessary staff assistance." A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975, p. 12.

b. Maintain the permanent records of the State and local committees.

c. Ensure that local committees meet regularly and attend such meetings whenever possible.

d. Make personal surveys and investigations to determine that agreements between the segments are being implemented.

e. Mediate local disputes whenever possible.

f. Perform other staff and research work as is appropriate to the functions of the State Committee.

g. Prepare the Committee's annual report to the governing boards of the segments and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, together with such observations and recommendations as seem appropriate.

5. So that continuing education credit offerings may be coordinated, the University Extension and the State College Extension Services shall submit, in advance, to the State Committee the credit offerings contemplated off their campuses. The State Committee shall determine the precise dates in the spring and fall when such information shall be submitted. Furthermore, the State Committee shall distribute relevant information collected to the appropriate local committees.

If properly supported by the governing boards of the segments and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education this coordinating machinery, utilizing the guidelines on functions presented in Section II, can give constructive leadership in the years ahead.

The Director of the Coordinating Council should be responsible for calling the first meeting of the State Committee on Continuing Education.

SECTION IV

FINANCE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

JUNIOR COLLEGES

As noted in Section I of this study, the Junior Colleges play a leading role in offering higher education programs both graded and non-graded for the part-time student. State financial support for these Junior College students is provided upon an entirely different basis than for part-time students of the State Colleges and University. It is useful, therefore, to examine in some detail the method through which State support for the Junior Colleges is provided.

Current State Financial Support for Junior College Current Operations

State financial support for Junior College current operations is authorized under provisions of the State Constitution and is currently provided through a foundation program established by statute.[1] The foundation program apportioned approximately $30.9 million in State funds to the Junior Colleges in the fiscal year 1961-62 of which $25.2 million (81.4%) was for "basic aid" and $5.7 million (18.6%) was for "equalization aid".

Basic Aid. The foundation program, through which State support for current operations is provided to individual districts, assures the district of an annual state income of $125, called "basic aid", for each unit of the total average daily attendance (a.d.a.) of the district.[2]

Equalization Aid. The district may, under certain conditions, receive additional State support, called "equalization aid", for that part of the total average daily attendance based upon students who reside in the district. These resident students are classified as either minors or adults[3] and equalization aid is computed differently for each of these groups.

Equalization Aid for Resident Minors. Resident minors account for the larger share of the resident enrollment of a district (78.6% of the total statewide resident units of average daily attendance was so classified in 1961-62) and equalization aid is received for them if the financial resources of the district, along with the State basic aid provided for the students, does not produce the funds considered necessary for an "adequate educational program". At the present time the cost of such a program for these students has been determined by legislative action to be $543 for each unit of average daily attendance. This cost, known as the "foundation amount", was increased from $494 to $543 in 1961 and was based upon a rough estimate of the average total current expense per unit of average daily attendance in schools operated by separate Junior College districts. To determine the exact amount of equalization aid, if any, the district will receive for these resident minors, the $125 per unit of average daily attendance provided by the State as basic aid is added to an amount per unit of average daily attendance (of resident minors) contributed by the district from a computational tax of 24¢ against the assessed valuation of the district. If this total does not equal $543, the difference is provided by the State as equalization aid for each unit of the district's average daily attendance.

Equalization Aid for Resident Adults. Equalization aid is received for resident adults if the district receives equalization aid for the resident minors and if this aid is greater than $63 per unit of resident minor average daily attendance. The amount received per unit of resident adult average daily attendance will vary to a maximum of $95 depending upon how much the unit amount of equalization aid for minors exceeds $63. In no case, however, is an amount greater than $95 per unit of resident adult average attendance allowed. Total support (basic aid plus equalization aid) provided by the State for resident adults is, therefore, never less than $125 nor more than $220 per unit of average daily attendance.

State Support for Adult and Minor Average Daily Attendance in 1961-62

The above discussion of State financial support for Junior College current operations shows that State "basic aid" is provided for every unit of Junior College average daily attendance whether the average daily attendance is derived from resident students, non-resident students, or students defined as adults or minors. "Equalization Aid", however, is provided *only* for average daily attendance derived from resident students and the amount of equalization aid is

---

[1] In addition to the funds provided through the foundation program a district may bill the appropriate counties for the actual cost—less Federal and State apportionments—of educating nonresident students plus $300 each for the facilities provided. Further, every district may levy a general purpose tax up to 11¢ in addition to the 24¢ district tax upon which the foundation amount is based, or a total of 35¢. The district may, by a simple voting majority of the district approving, levy a general purpose tax in excess of 35¢.

[2] One unit of average daily attendance is roughly equivalent to one full-time student in attendance for one year. The units of average daily attendance are computed by dividing the total number of whole and partial class hours of pupil attendance during the fiscal year by 525.

[3] *Education Code* Section 6352 defines an adult as a student over 21 years of age who enrolled for less than 10 class hours per week. Those students over 21 years of age who are enrolled in more than 10 class hours per week are classified with the minors.

computed differently for the average daily attendance derived from the resident students defined as adults and those defined as minors.

The computation of equalization aid, based upon a definition of students as adults or minors without regard to the type of class,[1] does not take into consideration the cost of educating students.

TABLE I

Average Daily Attendance by Type of Class and Students, Cost by Type of Class, and State Support by Type of Student Shown as Percent of Cost by Type of Class

Type of Student within Type of Class	Junior Colleges 1961-62			
	Average daily Attendance	Cost of class[1]	State Support	
			Amount[2]	As a percent of cost of class
Graded Classes	191,205	$569		
Adult[3]	32,061		$130	23%
Minors[4]	159,144		$159	28%
Nongraded Classes[5]	10,383	$364		
Adults[3]	9,109		$130	36%
Minors[4]	1,274		$150	44%

SOURCE: Tables 1 and 2 Appendix D
[1] Current expense per unit of a.d.a. (Table 2 of Appendix)
[2] State aid per unit of a.d.a. (Table I of Appendix) rounded to nearest dollar.
[3] Students over 21 years taking less than 10 class hours per week. (Education Code Sec. 6352)
[4] Students over 21 years taking more than 10 class hours per week are counted with the minors.
[5] Classes for adults.

Table 1 shows that 78% of the average daily attendance classified as "adult" in Junior Colleges in 1961-62 was accrued from students enrolled in graded classes and only 22% from students enrolled in non-graded classes (classes for adults). The table also shows that State support for the average daily attendance derived from students classified as adult was provided at the rate of $130 per unit of a.d.a. whether the students were enrolled in graded or non-graded classes—a rate which provided 36% of the cost of adult average daily attendance when it was derived from students enrolled in non-graded classes, but only 23% of the cost of adult average daily attendance when it was derived from students enrolled in graded classes. This lack of relationship between State support and the cost of educating students is even more apparent for the average daily attendance derived from "minors". The State provided 28% of the cost of minor average daily attendance derived from students enrolled in graded classes, but 44% of the cost of average daily attendance derived from minor students enrolled in non-graded classes.

Implications of the Definition of Adults

It is clear the use of an arbitrary definition of adults (*Education Code*, Sec. 6352) to determine support not only for enrollments in non-graded classes, but in graded classes as well, fails to reflect the costs of the classes in which the enrollments occur. Support in terms of the "type" of student does not appear to be educationally or practically as valid as support in terms of the "type" of classes offered.

Although the intended purpose of the statutory definition of adults was apparently to provide less State support for older students, it has, through *Education Code* Sec. 17667 significantly reduced levels of State support for the entire Junior College program. This section of the *Code* excludes resident adults as legally defined from the computation through which the level of local support is determined.[2] The result has been to raise the level of local support and thus decrease the level of State support. Should the current foundation program be modified either by eliminating the definition of adults or by striking Section 17667, the overall level of State support would be substantially increased, for such a change would dilute the amount of district support per a.d.a.

Requirement for Change

It has been shown that elimination of the definition of the adult would have a marked affect on Junior College support from the State. It is appropriate to ask whether changes are required for other than financial reasons.

The definition of an adult and its corresponding uses in determining finance as shown in Sec. I of this report tend to greatly confuse the delineation of what may properly be called continuing education programs in the Junior Colleges.

Continuing education programs in higher education should have sufficient distinctions to be set apart from the regular offerings of the institutions. In the State Colleges and the University, apart from the fees charged, extension programs may be identified by the fact that degrees are not conferred through the programs, although courses taken may be applied toward degrees. Such a distinction cannot be made at the Junior College level. A distinction which can be made, however, is in terms of the classes for adults, or more appropriately termed non-graded classes.

Once a distinction of this nature is made, definition of the student served, i.e. "adult", becomes superfluous. Retention of the definition cannot be logically supported when it is accepted that the only distinction which can be properly made is between the graded and non-graded class. The elimination of the statutory definition of the adult would tend to clarify the extent and limits of continuing education in the Junior Colleges.

Furthermore, the elimination of the definition of adults would greatly simplify the accumulation and reporting of Junior College enrollment statistics and would make them more comparable with those accumulated and reported by the University and the State Colleges.

[1] Graded or nongraded class.

[2] Resident adult a.d.a. is not counted to determine whether a district is eligible for equalization aid and the amount of that aid.

The Impact of Changes

A case can be made for the elimination of the definition of the adult and the providing of support based upon the cost of instruction by type of class. It is useful to explore the impact these changes would have.

The elimination of the statutory definition of an adult would, under the current foundation program, based upon a foundation amount ($543) related to graded classes, result in the same level of State support for all resident students regardless of whether they were attending graded or non-graded classes. Since the cost of instruction in non-graded classes is considerably less than the cost in graded classes, it would be appropriate to modify the current foundation program through the establishment of a separate foundation amount for non-graded classes which is reflective of the costs of such classes.

The State Board of Education has adopted recommendations which provide that the foundation amount for regular a.d.a. in non-graded classes (classes for adults) at the Junior College and high school levels should be determined on the basis of statewide costs of such classes not to exceed the county-wide foundation program for regular high school classes. The appropriate amount which might be applied currently is calculated at approximately $345 per unit of a.d.a.

Creation of a foundation program and amount for non-graded classes which reflects the statewide costs of these classes, in itself, would have no great fiscal effect upon State support, since average daily attendance in non-graded classes is small in comparison with total a.d.a. and since districts currently receiving only basic aid would continue at that level.

Of greater significance with regard to State support would be the increased average daily attendance in graded classes which would accrue from that average daily attendance formerly identified as adult and which would now be supported through the foundation amount ($543) for graded classes.

The additional cost to the State resulting from the elimination of the definition of adults and the establishment of separate foundation amounts for graded and non-graded classes would probably approach $9 million at the present time. Should the foundation amount for graded classes be increased to $600 the increased State support would approach $14 million. An increase of $14 million, when added to the $34.5 million to be allocated to the Junior Colleges by the State in 1962-63 under current programs, would bring the percentage of State support of Junior College current operating expenditures (estimated to be $131 million in 1962-63) up to 37%—a percentage approaching the Master Plan's recommended 45%.

Thus, the resulting impact of regularizing support for non-graded classes in terms of the cost of such classes is of major dimensions. Consideration of the statutory changes explored above directly affects the State's policies for support of the public Junior Colleges.

Criteria for Junior College Graded Classes

An additional consideration to any changes in support levels for older students is the development of adequate guidelines to assure that graded classes are, in fact, worthy of the designation. Opportunity to class courses as "graded" chiefly to gain higher support levels (assuming a lower foundation program for non-graded classes) from the State should not be allowed. The State Board of Education in recent months has sought to achieve adequate distinctions between graded and non-graded classes at the Junior College level in response to legislative direction. The Board's efforts are explored below.

In 1961 the Legislature directed: "The State Board of Education shall establish criteria and standards for graded classes in grades 13 and 14."[1] The importance of this action was noted in a memorandum prepared by the State Department of Education for the Board which stated:

> The establishment of criteria and standards for graded junior college courses by the State Board of Education may well be one of the most significant and yet difficult assignments imposed by the State Legislature in recent years. Criteria and standards apply to the entire program of instruction and involve the fundamental nature and purpose of every course offered by junior colleges in the state.[2]

After some two years of development of the criteria, the State Board adopted amendments to the *Administrative Code* at their meeting of February 14-15, 1963. These criteria, presented in Appendix C of this report, were developed in discussions among State Department officials, members of the California Junior College Association, and the Association for Adult Education Administrators. The criteria went through some 16 drafts and were the subject of review by a subcommittee of the State Board.

Full implementation of the criteria will take place in the fall of 1963. Before that time it will be impossible to fully assess the impact the criteria will have upon distribution of enrollments between graded and non-graded classes.

A recent action of the State Board should be noted in connection with the criteria for graded classes. The Board on March 14-15 adopted a provision whereby Junior College governing boards may grant credit toward an associate degree for completion of courses established as classes for adults. While this amendment to the *Administrative Code* is intended to regularize procedures (granting of credit has been previously done under the general provisions of the *Education Code* using varying criteria) the fact of

[1] *Education Code*, 5718.5.
[2] July 6, 1962.

the provision's adoption, rather than elimination of the opportunity to grant credit completely, weakens the concept of the graded class. It must be noted, however, the Board has little latitude in this area without statutory changes.

The adoption of the criteria is a significent step toward assuring that a differentiation is maintained between non-graded classes and graded classes at the Junior Colleges. Much of the burden for maintaining this differentiation is placed upon the State Department of Education which must approve courses offered and their designation as graded or non-graded.

Summary

The foregoing has presented the current methods of finance for the Junior Colleges and the role that these methods play in the identification of continuing education programs. It is clear that the financing of continuing education programs cannot be separated from the entire question of financing Junior Colleges.

Methods of change have been explored in this section of the report that would provide a more easily definable, straightforward, and logical pattern of support for older students in both graded and non-graded classes.

The discussion, however, points up a policy question, devolving primarily on the extent of State support accorded to the Junior Colleges and the rate and fashion in which increases should be instituted. Furthermore, criteria for graded classes have not yet been implemented. Their implementation coupled with matriculation requirements (as presented in Section II of this report) may substantially affect the patterns of Junior College enrollments.

Any consideration of the financing of continuing education programs at the Junior College level implies a consideration of the whole of Junior College finance, and, therefore, any modification can only be made with reference to the whole.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. In view of the interrelationship of the financing of continuing education programs to the whole of Junior College finance and in view of the fact that the impact of criteria for graded classes and matriculation requirements is not now apparent, no changes be made in support for adult students unless considered in reference to the whole of Junior College finance and at a time when the impact of criteria for graded classes and matriculation may be adequately assessed.

2. The Study of the Junior Colleges and their finance approved by the Council on February 19, 1963, may provide the vehicle through which recommendations can be made for the finance of continuing education programs at the Junior Colleges.

STATE COLLEGES

In accordance with established State policy, State College extension programs are designed to be supported entirely through fees charged students. The implications and extent of self-support are briefly examined below.

Costs of Programs

Expenditures for State College Extension during 1961-62 amounted to $700,210; during 1962-63 costs will approach $750,000; and for 1963-64 $789,670 is budgeted. The Chancellor's office has reported that not only do student fees meet expenditures, but that in 1961-62 ". . . all colleges reported that surplus earnings were reverted to the General Fund."[1]

Instructors' salaries present the largest single expense in State College extension programs constituting 68.8% in 1961-62. Administration, temporary help, operating expenses, and equipment contribute the balance of expenditures.

Not all colleges charge administrative expenses directly to extension budgets. Among the eight colleges that do (those having larger programs), the percentage of administrative costs[2] to individual extension budgets averages 13.79%. The two largest extension programs, San Francisco and San Jose, reported 20.45% and 21.92% respectively.

The variations in administrative costs are largely attributable to the differing methods of charging salaries of personnel to extension budgets. For example, only two colleges charge a portion (.25) of the salaries of their Dean of Educational Services and Summer Session to extension budgets. Presumably, the proration of salary costs for other employees as well is uncommon in the smaller operations. Chico, Orange, San Fernando, Sonoma and Stanislaus State Colleges make no charges for any personnel other than teaching personnel.[3] Operating expenses (mileage, printing, classroom rentals, communications and general expenses) are reported by all colleges in amounts ranging from 3.18% of the extension budget at Orange State College to 25.98% at Sonoma.[4] The average is 14.81%.

General Considerations

No statewide budget is developed for State College extension programs. Current organization of the various programs would not permit an effective budgetary system on such a basis. Furthermore, the Chancellor's office has no plans for the development of such a system.

---

[1] *Characteristics of Extension Programs . . . 1961-62* (Office of the Chancellor, February 1963), p. 11.

[2] Administrative Costs were reported by the colleges as including the salaries of Dean, Coordinator, Clerk and Student Assistant positions.

[3] San Fernando and Sonoma did make charges for temporary help—$691 and $494 respectively in 1961-62.

[4] Variation in such expense is due in part to the extent of geographical area covered in the field program.

Available evidence does not clearly indicate that all costs of extension programs are supported by income from fees because of the varying policies—largely dependent upon size of the extension operations—toward the charging of costs beyond actual teaching salaries. This method of accounting for indirect costs may be balanced by surpluses generated in the course of operations which are reverted to the State's General Fund.

If the State Colleges were permitted to retain any surpluses, such amounts could be employed for planning and "risk" purposes, preferably distributed on a statewide basis to areas of greatest need.

As shown in Section I of this report, the State Colleges serve a clientele composed primarily of public school teachers and other public service employees. For example, the State Colleges report that city and county school offices requested 73% of the courses offered by State Colleges in their field program for 1961-62. The major portion of the remainder were requested by other special interest groups.

Development of extension courses for such clientele follow a pattern wherein the initiative is exercised by the clientele rather than the sponsoring institution. The administrative costs of extension programs are considerably increased when initiative is taken by the institution to develop offerings, both credit and noncredit, where the need is not expressly demonstrated by the potential clientele. Such responsibility for initiative falls more generally within the responsibilities of the public land-grant university because of its statewide public service functions. (It must be recognized, however, that State College extension does have certain necessary administrative costs.)

It is therefore feasible and appropriate to conduct State College extension programs, given their present character and stated future objectives, on a self-supporting basis.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. In view of the character, organization, and stated objectives of State Colleges extension programs, such programs be supported by student fees.

2. The State Colleges immediately institute comprehensive, uniform accounting systems and procedures on all campuses to determine direct and indirect costs of all extension operations to insure that all costs attributable to extension are charged against the extension budgets.

3. Every effort be made to assure that the accounting systems and procedures of the State Colleges' Extension Services and the University Extension are as directly comparable as possible, and that both provide the data needed for analysis to the State Committee on Continuing Education.

4. The Trustees of the California State Colleges should be permitted to retain surpluses developed in the operation of the various State College extension programs; such funds to be apportioned on a statewide basis to areas of greatest need.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

University Extension is primarily supported by fees, however, in contrast to State College extension programs, the State contributes a portion of Extension costs. The significance and rationale of this support is explored below.

Costs of University Extension and Extent of State Support

Table 2 shows the income and costs of operation of University Extension in recent years together with proposed levels for 1963-64. Totals show that State support underwent adjustment in 1959-60 when support was reduced to approximately 9%. From that time to the present, State support has remained at approximately this same level.

The table also illustrates variations in income and expenditures inherent in an operation dependent upon income derived from its clientele. In some years income may not cover costs, while in other years surpluses may occur which are retained or used to make up any previous or future losses.

TABLE 2

University Extension: Budgets and Extent of State Support

	Actual 1958-59	Actual 1959-60	Actual 1960-61	Actual 1961-62	Budgeted 1962-63	Proposed 1963-64
State Support	$928,087	$544,984	$654,254	$817,150	$839,648[1]	$857,000[1]
Total Income	5,776,256	6,221,649	7,244,193	8,056,510	8,724,203[2]	9,248,000[2]
State Support as % of Income	16.07%	8.76%	9.03%	10.14%	9.62%	9.23%
Cost of Operations[3]	5,632,791	6,262,927	7,714,171	7,346,314	8,714,203	9,248,000
State Support as % of Operations	16.48%	8.70%	8.48%	11.12%	9.64%	9.27%

[1] Includes $25,000 special medical appropriation.
[2] Includes fee income and state support only.
[3] Figures shown vary from totals shown in the Regents' and Governor's Budget. Figures do not include auxiliary programs (i.e., Lake Arrowhead Center, Repertory Theater and Real Estate Program.)
Source: University Extension; "University of California Budget for Current Operations, 1963-64."

A more detailed examination of past Extension budgets also will show considerable variation in amounts assigned to specific account categories. These variations have been caused by revisions of methods of accounting and the reassignment of Extension staff between statewide administration and area operations. The often abrupt upward trend in administrative costs may be balanced by the rapid increases in fees collected and the general growth of the program.

The Concept of Ready-to-Serve Costs and State Support for University Extension

Since 1912 University Extension has received State funds in varying amounts for support of portions of its programs. From time to time this policy has been examined by the Regents as well as by the Legislature and the Department of Finance, and was most recently reviewed in 1959 when the Legislature reduced support over previous levels.

University Extension asserts that "ready-to-serve" costs should be recognized as the basis upon which State support should be determined because, "... the State should recognize and honor an obligation to provide basic core support necessary to mount the sort of imaginative up-to-date adult education program required to meet today's expanding needs for technical training and citizen information."[1]

[1] Statement of the Dean of University Extension to the Director of the Council.

A definition of "ready-to-serve" costs in 1953 established the orientation for current University policy. After a study of the financing of University Extension, the President of the University recommended to the Regents a top limitation of 25% State support of expenditures. This recommendation was approved. At that time ready-to-serve costs were calculated at 23.7% of the 1953-54 budget. However, in succeeding years (before reduction to approximately 9% in the 1959-60 fiscal year) State support did not exceed 19.1%. Items included within the 1953 definition of "ready-to-serve" costs were (employing account categories of the time):

Director's Administration
Business Manager's Administration
Class Administration
Information and Fee Offices
Recording Offices
Veterans Affairs
Central Stenographic Services
(For Administration offices)
Rent and maintenance of space
(This item not to be included in the 25% maximum)

Within present University Extension accounts, ready-to-serve costs would now include the categories shown on the following page. These categories include some 21.4% of the 1962-63 Extension budget (Table 3).

TABLE 3

University Extension—Detail of Administrative and Planning Costs

	Extension Account Nos.	1962-63 Budget	
1. Statewide Dean's Office, Northern and Southern Area Offices (Directors and Associate Directors)			
Statewide Dean's Office	627301	$91,398.00	
Directors' Offices	627305	70,936.00	
Associate Directors' Offices	627303,627304,627306	74,103.00	
Total			$236,437.00
2. Offices of Extension Heads on Smaller Campuses (Santa Barbara, Riverside, San Diego, Orange County)	627468,627469,627470 627471		168,216.00
3. Fee and Information Offices, Recording Offices, Fee and Information Offices (Berkeley, Davis, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Hillstreet)	627320,627472,627473	$257,553.000	
Recording Offices	627324	155,475.000	
Total			413,028.00
4. Northern and Southern Area Administrative Functions			
Business and Financial Offices	627314	$186,362.000	
Accounting	627315	24,200.000	
Payroll	627316	17,880.000	
Personnel	627328	39,485.000	
Operation Services	627327	35,952.000	
Program Processing	627322	71,491.000	
Total			375,370.00
Program Planning (Includes one Program Planner @ $8,500 and one Secretary @ $4,000 for each of 19 Instruction Departments, not including Jurisprudence, Medicine, Dentistry, or four minor departments.)	Various		237,500.00
6. Program Promotion (Includes core staff of departments at Berkeley and Los Angeles: 2 Department Heads @ $10,000; 2 Writers @ $8,000; 4 Secretaries @ $4,000)	627505,627509		52,000.00
7. Rent and Maintenance of facilities owned or leased by University	627325		380,002.00
Total, Administrative and Planning Costs			$1,862,553.00
Total 1962-63 Budget			$8,714,203.00
Administrative and Planning Costs as % of Budget			21.4%

Source: University Extension

It is apparent that should the concept of ready-to-serve costs (as defined by the University) be accepted as a basis for State support, then the current State subsidy would have to be more than doubled, to a level maintained as late as 1953-54.

Considerations for Increased State Support

It is argued that many worthwhile functions and programs were eliminated or curtailed and that the Extension audience was limited by the increases in fees[1] necessitated by the reduction of State support in 1959. It is therefore claimed that support should once more be increased to cover fully the "ready-to-serve" costs so that Extension will be in a better position to serve the public.

In considering the case for increased State funds, the changes caused by the 1959-60 reduction should be examined to determine whether or not Extension programs were substantially curtailed and important functions reduced in scope.

The lowering of support resulted in a 20% increase in tuition fees which in turn realized an 11.8% increase in income while enrollments suffered a reduction as a result of those increases. In addition, minimum class sizes were increased from 12 to 15 in the Southern Area, and from 15 to 18 in the Northern Area.

The impact of the Legislative reduction is shown in Table 4 which shows the number of programs offered and the total numbers of registrations recorded since 1958.

TABLE 4

University Extension: Programs and Registrations

Year	Programs	Registrations
1958-1959	4,854	165,344
1959-60	5,144	177,288
1960-61	5,251	188,339
1961-62	4,772	184,233

SOURCE: 1958-59, "Adult Education in California" (Master Plan Technical Committee Report, 1961), p. 12; 1959-1962, 1961-62 "Statistical Summary" (University Extension, Office of the Dean, September 28, 1962), p. 4.

While the reduction in State support occurred in the 1959-60 budget, full impact of the changes did not occur until 1961-62 when enrollments suffered a slight drop and the number of programs were reduced. The enrollment decrease in all likelihood is temporary as estimates for the current year (1962-63) show 193,500 registrations and 205,500 are projected for 1963-64.

Cancellation of classes and courses show a similar pattern, as shown in Table 5, with rates of discontinuance higher in 1961-62 than in the two prior years.

The delay in the impact of changes in support may be found in an examination of the University Extension budget for the years in question. In the 1959-60 and 1960-61 fiscal years, reserves were apparently used to carry the program forward. Expenditures for operations increased from about $5.6 million in 1958-59 to some $7.7 million in 1960-61. Curtailment of costs occurred in 1961-62 when about $7.35 million was expended for operations for the moderately reduced enrollments and programs of that year. It is significant to note, however, that in 1961-62 some $478,000 was placed in the unexpended reserve fund —presumably to replace funds used in 1959-61 to maintain the higher level program.

TABLE 5

University Extension: Cancellation of Programs

Year	Percent Discontinued All Programs	Percent Discontinued Classes Only[1]
1959-60	10.6%	12.7%
1960-61	11.3%	13.5%
1961-62	13.7%	16.1%

SOURCE: 1961-62 Statistical Summary, p. 7.
[1] Credit and non-credit

There is no doubt that the reduction in State support did substantially affect University Extension. Though its effect was delayed, enrollments dropped and classes were eliminated. In addition certain staff and services were eliminated, namely three statewide departments: Department of Conferences and Community Services; Department of Mass Communication and Public Information; and the Department of Planning and Development. An educational film production unit in the Southern Area was also discontinued.

In view of the information at hand, it does not appear that University Extension operations were materially damaged by the change in State support. The effect, of course, was necessarily minimized—and correctly so—by the administration of University Extension which eliminated less essential operations at the administrative level and curtailed marginal classes. The effect would be more alarming could it be shown that remote areas, now unserved, have been neglected solely because of the lack of State support.

Determining the Proper Level of State Support

While it is true that University Extension is not the exclusive public agency for continuing education in California, certain factors make University Extension unique in comparison to other programs. University Extension possesses the only statewide organization for continuing education programs capable of mounting programs in the complete range of public higher education. Because of this mature organization it is able to produce on its own initiative specialized or general course offerings for the benefit of many groups and publics.

[1] The fee increases were instituted July 1, 1961.

It is able because of its long experience and present staff, to anticipate the educational needs of much of California society and to create programs of a unique nature. In addition, its pioneering efforts in post-graduate professional education must be recognized as a major achievement which is reflected in the economic progress and opportunities in California.

Duplication of University Extension's efforts, its organization, and its unique programs—as pointed out in Section II of this report—would be inadvisable. Therefore, it should be realized that University Extension has attributes which single it out for consideration in somewhat different terms than other continuing education programs.

It is appropriate that the State recognize these attributes and accept (as has been done in the past) a responsibility for ensuring insofar as possible the continued operation of the comprehensive program of University Extension. Acceptance of this responsibility implies certain financial support. It is necessary, therefore, to seek a proper level for that support; a level which will assure the continued effective operation of the Extension program.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. In view of the scope, purpose and role of University Extension, State support should be accorded to University Extension for those functions directly related to maintenance of the unique statewide character of Extension programs. Costs to be borne by the State should bear a relationship to the overall Extension budget substantially similar to that obtaining in the 1962-63 Budget. The balance of costs not supported by the State shall be supported through fees charged students.

2. University Extension immediately institute comprehensive, uniform accounting systems and procedures to determine direct and indirect costs of all Extension operations to insure that all costs attributable to Extension are charged to the statewide Extension budget.

3. Every effort be made to assure that the accounting systems and procedures of University Extension and the State Colleges' Extension Services are as directly comparable as possible, and that both provide the data needed for analysis to the State Committee on Continuing Education.

SECTION V

DESIGNATION OF GENERAL EXTENSION CENTERS

Recommendations developed in Section II of this report concerning the delineation of functions in continuing education have specified that a full range of extension offerings may be presented at "existing extension centers." It is essential, therefore, to explore the current situation in regard to such centers for purposes of definition and to establish procedures for the creation of additional centers should the need arise.

For clarification, centers where a full-range of offerings may be given should be designated "general extension centers" to differentiate from other field locations.

Present Facilities

At the present time, both University Extension and State College extension programs are conducted throughout the State in a variety of specific locations and facilities. In many instances several classes may be offered more or less coincidentally at the same location. Such concentrations of classes should not be identified as "general extension centers." However, some locations where classes are presented might be considered to be "general extension centers." By utilizing a criteria of 12 or more classes at a specific location given during the full academic year, it is found that State College programs are conducted at seven locations which might be considered as "general extension centers."[1] Rent is paid at none of the seven (San Francisco State's Downtown Extension Center is, however, owned by the State) and administrative offices are maintained only at the above mentioned Downtown Center. A consideration of the average number of courses given at the seven locations shows the greatest concentration at the San Francisco Downtown Extension Center, 116, as opposed to the next highest, 44, in Fresno.

By the above criteria it is apparent that San Francisco's Downtown Center may be identified as a general extension center wherein a full range of courses may be appropriately offered: it has a large number of courses, it is in permanent facilities dedicated chiefly to extension, and administrative offices are maintained on the premises. Furthermore, this center has been traditionally considered a full-fledged center by the State Colleges, where other locations have not. Other locations where classes are given at the present time should not properly be defined as extension centers for the purposes of presenting a full range of course offerings.

Off campus University Extension locations, far more numerous, present a more difficult problem of designation. Again, taking a criteria of 12 courses or more given during a full year occupancy, and in addition taking only those off campus facilities rented (or owned), it is found that University Extension has some 38 such "centers."[2] Administrative offices are maintained at 8 of these locations: the Hillstreet and Western Avenue Buildings in Los Angeles, China Lake, Buena Park, Lake Arrowhead, Point Mugu, San Diego (downtown), and San Francisco.

Examination of the number of courses given at these eight locations shows four at which more than 100 classes are presented in a year—Los Angeles (Hillstreet), 545; Buena Park, 210; San Francisco, 345; and San Diego (downtown), 194.

It is clear that no specific criteria exist for the description of general extension centers for University Extension. Elements may be cited—number of classes, administrative offices, permanent facilities, etc.—however, these elements alone are not adequate for the purposes of this report.

It is appropriate to consider the general designations applied to the locations indicating those which are the most important and offer the greatest range of programs. Thus, the centers in Los Angeles (Hillstreet Building) and the San Francisco location properly deserve recognition. Both offer large numbers of classes, both serve large metropolitan areas, and most important, both have been traditionally identified by the University as major centers. They should, therefore, be designated "general extension centers."

Designation of Additional Centers

Provision should be made for the orderly creation of new general extension centers as their need becomes apparent. It is clear that the designation of extension centers where a full range program may be offered must be conducted in a careful manner in order to maintain a proper delineation of function and to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Several criteria should be met and factors considered before the establishment of new general extension centers.

[1] See Appendix B for listing of locations.

[2] See Appendix B for listings of locations.

1. General extension centers should serve large metropolitan areas. Junior Colleges and field extension programs can more economically serve less populous areas.

2. It should be established that a general extension program can be economically carried out, and the establishment of a full range program will not in fact result in unnecessary administrative and housing costs prior to designation of the general extension center.

3. In so far as possible, a proposed general extension center should not be established to serve one specific interest group. The program offered should reflect the needs of the area's population as a whole.

To insure the coordinated and careful establishment of general extension centers, all proposals should be submitted to the State Committee on Continuing Education. The Committee should study the proposal, and submit its findings and recommendations to the Coordinating Council. Council action, conducted in terms of its general responsibility for coordination and its specific charge to comment on the need for new programs and facilities, should be considered binding by the segments.

Facilities for Extension

In the preceding discussion it was shown that mostly all programs for extension are in rented facilities or in facilities provided at no charge. There are two exceptions—San Francisco State Downtown Center and the San Francisco University Extension Center. These two general extension centers operate in their own facilities, although neither building was constructed for the program currently housed on the premises.[1]

A case can no doubt be made for the purchase or construction of general extension centers on the basis of longrun costs. However, any proposals should be considered in terms of whether or not such capital outlay is appropriate for extension operations given their function and nature.

Consequently, any proposal to purchase or construct facilities for extension programs should be closely examined and balanced with the long-term needs for facilities for public higher education. Such examination may be appropriately conducted by the Council as the occasion warrants.

University Extension Proposals for Sunnyvale

Special mention should be made of proposals of the University of California to locate an Extension Center in the vicinity of Sunnyvale.

Acting upon recommendations of the Liaison Committee, the State Board and the Regents early in 1958 approved a proposal for the University to take immediate steps to offer off-campus instruction in engineering at a suitable location, or locations, in the vicinity of San Jose and to take similar steps in other areas of the State when justified.

Subsequently, the President of the University requested augmentation of the University's budget for 1958-59 in the amount of $660,000 to acquire sites and to construct two off-campus centers, one in the East Los Angeles-Orange County area and the other in the Santa Clara Valley area. These centers would have offered courses primarily at the graduate level in engineering, the sciences and mathematics.

Augmentation not forthcoming, the request was again renewed in the University's 1959-60 budget request, this time in the amount of $330,000. The item, however, was not included in the Governor's Budget.

In January 1959, the Regents accepted a 3½ acre gift of land in Sunnyvale for an Extension center from the International Science Foundation. This gift was contingent upon State funds for construction and the purchase of additional land. This agreement was later revised (November 1960) to provide for the reversion of the land to the Foundation if a center was not developed by July 1, 1965.

Since the time of the gift of the land, the University has sought to obtain non-state funds, explored lease-purchase arrangements, and has requested State Funds for the project in the 1962-63 budget and the 1963-64 budget (in neither instance were the requests submitted to the Legislature in the Governor's Budget).

Recent action of the City of Sunnyvale to place a street through the property, thus bisecting it, caused the Regents to acquire early in 1963, 4 acres at a cost of $95,000 adjacent to the original parcel. The unfunded project is planned at the present time to cost some $504,100 for a building of 14,650 assignable square feet.

While the project may be said to have been duly authorized, the lapse of time during which funds have been sought has been considerable. During that period educational needs to be met by Extension may have changed considerably, thus a restudy of the matter may be in order. In addition, the advisability of establishing a permanent center in that location should be considered in light of the current educational needs of the State.

Sunnyvale cannot apparently be considered as a general extension center for the purposes of offering a full range of Extension programs. The matter should be restudied by the University and considered by the Council before any future requests are made for State funds for construction or any monies expended from student fee income for a similar purpose.

[1] The University Extension Arrowhead Center is owned by the University. It is, however, operated chiefly for conference use.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. Those locations where a full range of extension programs may be offered in accordance with recommendations on delineation of functions, be designated as "general extension centers" to distinguish them from other locations wherein several courses are offered.

2. The San Francisco State College Extension Downtown Center be designated a general extension center for purposes of offering a full range of extension programs; for University Extension, the Hillstreet Extension Center in Los Angeles and the San Francisco Center be likewise designated general extension centers.

3. Proposals to establish or upgrade any other locations to general extension centers be studied by the State Committee on Continuing Education and the results of those studies presented to the Coordinating Council for appropriate action.

SECTION VI

CONCLUSION

This report has presented certain findings and recommendations concerning continuing education programs in California public higher education. It has briefly surveyed the programs sponsored by the University of California, the California State Colleges and the public Junior Colleges. Based upon that survey, recommendations have been made concerning delineation of functions, coordination, and finance. In addition, the designation of general extension centers has been considered.

Throughout this report, effort has been made to examine programs in terms of statewide considerations emphasizing insofar as possible not the historical record, but requirements for the future.

What of the future? Continuing education programs sponsored by California's higher education institutions without doubt will continue to grow at least in proportion to the overall growth of the state's population. Yet the precise form that growth will take cannot be readily determined. The difficulties involved in forecasting lie chiefly with the nature of continuing education. The borderline between formal education—particularly in the programs examined within this study—and continuing education is far from clear.

A listing of the more important present functions *of continuing education recently stated by two experts* in the field [1] may shed some light upon the role of higher education in continuing education for the years to come. Continuing education may provide:

1. Education made necessary by special occasions of societal dislocation (i.e., retraining, citizenship training).
2. Remedial programs.
3. Education in connection with actual experience.
4. Duplication of instruction provided by the formal education institutions.
5. Specialized vocational training.
6. Cultural materials and support to the values of education, learning, thinking, and reflection.
7. Instruction for special interests.

For the most part, the continuing education programs considered in this study have been primarily concerned with point number four above—the duplication of instruction provided within the regular educational program. This will no doubt continue and the distinctions between continuing education programs and the regular program will become more difficult to make. This s perhaps most true at the Junior College level. ". . . If present trends continue the distinction between adult (continuing) education and formal education, particularly in the Junior Colleges, will remain highly ambiguous." [2] It is apparent that the Junior Colleges, especially, should maintain a continuing, comprehensive examination of their programs; not merely in terms of legislated criteria, but in terms of overall educational policy as well. To expect formal education to reflect in organized curricula all the needs for occupational training at a given point in time is most probably not realistic.

While the institutions of public higher education have been involved in the other functions through their extension or adult programs, their involvement is of limited nature. This pattern will likely continue in the future. A continuing education function in which higher education can make a greater contribution is in the function of encouraging cultural pursuits and the interpretation of cultural values. Also to a certain extent increased involvement can be expected outside the formal curriculum in sophisticated and specialized vocational training and in providing *programs for special* interests, particularly on the post-graduate professional level.

While future trends may cause significant changes in the educational organization as we know it today, it is certain that California public higher education's continuing education programs, however organized, have significant roles to play in providing for the education of the State's citizens. These roles should be developed from the unique abilities of each segment and should not duplicate efforts conducted by non-educational organizations or by other levels of education.

To conclude, this report is not intended to be a definitive document. Many subjects briefly noted require further study which may have great future impact. The State Coordinating Committee, the educational segments and other interested individuals will develop additional materials in the immediate future. It is therefore appropriate that the recommendations of this report and their implementation be re-examined from time to time.

[1] Jack London and Robert Wenkert, *Some Reflections on Defining Adult Education* (Berkeley: Survey Research Center, Univ. of Calif., March 1963) mimeo, pp. 13-14.

[2] London and Wenkert, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. A re-examination of the continuing education programs of public higher education and the coordinating machinery recommended by this report be made by June 1965 by the State Committee on Continuing Education. Such examination should determine if adequate progress toward creating orderly, efficient and coordinated programs has been made in terms of the general needs for continuing education programs at the higher education level.

2. Should results of the study so indicate, the Coordinating Council make additional recommendations concerning function, coordination machinery and finance as may be required.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Two Legislative directives requested the Council to study adult and extension education in California. They are as follows:

House Resolution No. 125
Adopted at the 1961 Session of the Legislature

WHEREAS, In many areas of the State there is an unfortunate and disturbing competition between the state colleges, junior colleges, and the University of California Extension; and

WHEREAS, The quality and the administration of extension services will be improved when this competition is eliminated; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Coordinating Council for Higher Education is requested to investigate the degree and amount of competition now existing between the University of California Extension Service, the state colleges, and the junior colleges; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Coordinating Council shall report to the Assembly by not later than the fifth calendar day of the 1963 Regular Session with recommendations as to how the competition can be eliminated.

Resolution Adopted by the Senate Finance Committee June 1, 1961

WHEREAS, The Coordinating Council for Higher Education has been assigned the task of "delineating the different functions of public higher education" and submitting to "Governor and Legislature within five days of the beginning of each general session a report which contains recommendations as to necessary or desirable changes, if any, in the functions and programs of the several segments of public higher education"; and

WHEREAS, the subjects of the level of student fees, non-resident tuition, space utilization, and coordination of extension and adult programs offered by public institutions appear to be among the most vital problems affecting the growth, development and financing of the system of public higher education in California; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable that progress reports on the study of these problems be submitted during the 1962 Budget Session and the final reports be submitted during the 1963 Regular Session in order that the Governor and Legislature be kept fully informed of the findings and recommendations which are developed from such study; therefore be it

RESOLVED by the S[enate] of the State of California, that the Coordi[nating Council] study the student fee problem at [the University and State] Colleges, define the nonin[structional activities to be] covered, and recommend a[n appropriate level of fees] and annual revisions to pr[ovide complete self-financ]ing;

That the C[oordinating C]ouncil study the feasibility of increasing non-resi[dent tuition at the Univer]sity and State Colleges [and of instituting an] appropriately representa[tive tuition charge for] California residents;

That the Coordinating [C]ouncil conduct, or cause to be conducted, a thoro[ugh study leading to the] establishing standards for [instructional space utili]zation, including scheduli[ng procedures; and

That the Coordinating [C]ouncil initiate a study of the various extension and [adult programs offered] by the University, State [Colleges and Junior Col]leges and propose method[s to assure a greater de]gree of coordination at a[ll levels among the par]ticipating institutions; an[d be it further

RESOLVED, That the [Coordinating Council for] Higher Education is requ[ested to submit progress] reports to the 1962 Budget [Session and final reports] to the 1963 General Sessio[n on plans for coordina]tion and orderly developm[ent in these four specific] areas.

APPEND[IX] B

In preparing this report the Council has had the assistance of a representative survey team and a technical committee of the State Advisory Committee on Adult Education. The Council wishes to acknowledge its appreciation to those individuals who assisted in the preparation of this report, but wishes to make clear that the report does not necessarily reflect the views of the individuals who assisted.

Following were the members of the survey team:

Dr. William B. Harwood, Director of Evening College, Foothill College

Mr. Harvey B. Rhodes, Dean of Adult Division, Modesto Junior College

* *Dr. Raymond A. Rydell*, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, California State Colleges

Dr. Ernest B. O'Byrne, Vice President, San Diego State College

Dr. Daniel G. Aldrich, Chancellor, University of California, Irvine

Dr. Frank L. Kidner, University Dean of Educational Relations, University of California

Mrs. Louise W. Hoyl, Director, Adult Education, Excelsior Evening High School

* Replaced Dr. Ralph Prator, President, San Fernando Valley State College.

** *Dr. Edward D. Goldman,* Assistant Superintendent of Adult and Vocational Education, San Francisco Unified School District

Dr. Carl H. Hancey, Dean, University College, University of Southern California

Technical Committee membership included:

Dr. Raymond N. Doyle, Dean, Educational Services and Summer Sessions, San Francisco State College

Dr. Oscar Edinger, President, Mt. San Antonio Junior College

Dr. Paul Sheats, Dean, University of California Extension

Mr. Stanley Sworder, Chief, Bureau of Adult Education, State Department of Education

Dr. Harry Wiser, Superintendent, Modesto City Junior College District

Special Consultant:

Dr. Donald McNeil, Mesa, Arizona

** Replaced Mr. Dalton Howatt, President, California Association of Adult Education Administrators.

APPENDIX C

JUNIOR COLLEGE GRADED CLASS CRITERIA

Section 1. Section 130 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code is amended to read:

130. STATE AID. The provisions of this article, *except Section 131.5,* are adopted under the authority of Section 5715, Education Code, and comprise the rules and regulations affirming and fixing the minimum standards entitling districts to receive state aid for the support of junior colleges.

Sec. 2. Section 131 of said title is amended by changing subsection (b) thereof to read:

(b) CURRICULUM. The junior college must establish such programs of education *and courses* as will permit the realization of the objectives and functions of the junior college. *Such courses shall be submitted to the State Department of Education for prior approval on forms provided by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Department of Education shall report to the State Board of Education at a fall and a spring meeting the actions which it has taken in approving the courses.*

Sec. 3. Section 131.5 is added to said title to read:

131.5. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR GRADED JUNIOR COLLEGE COURSES IN GRADES 13 AND 14. (a) DEFINITION. For the purposes of this subsection, a course of study is defined as an organized sequence of courses of a college within a given subject area.

(b) CRITERIA. A graded course (class) in grade 13 or 14 shall posses *one* or *more* of the following characteristics:

(1) The course provides credit toward an associate degree; is normally considered of collegiate level; and is approved by the State Board of Education as a component of, a prerequisite to, or eligible as a required or elective course within, a course of study which leads toward an associate degree.

(2) The course is approved by the State Board of Education, and is part of an occupational course of study of beyond high school level within the scope of the term "vocational and technical fields leading to employment" as the term is used in Education Code Section 22651 which leads toward an associate degree, an occupational certificate, or both.

(3) The course is approved by the State Board of Education and is recognized upon transfer by the University of California, a California state college, or an accredited independent college or university in California, as a part of:

(A) The required preparation toward a major;
(B) The general, or general education, requirement; or
(C) The permissible or recommended elective credits.

(c) STANDARDS. Any course meeting one or more of the above criteria shall meet *all* of the following standards:

(1) It is a course, approved by the State Board of Education, the content of which is organized to meet the requirements for the associate degree as specified in Section 131.7 or the requirements for an occupational certificate and is a part of a course of study not exceeding 70 units in length.

(2) It must be offered as described in the college catalog or a supplement thereto which provides an appropriate title, number, and accurate description of course content. A course outline is available at the college. Course requirements and credit awarded are consistent with Education Code Section 7807.

(3) It is a course in which are enrolled only those students who have met the prerequisites for the course.

(4) It is subject to the published standards of matriculation, attendance and achievement of the college, and the enrollees are awarded marks or grades on the basis of methods of evaluation set forth by the college and are subject to the standards of retention set forth in Section 131 or to such additional standards as may be established by the governing board of the district.

(5) It is a course in which enrollment shall *not* be repeated except in unusual circumstances and with the prior written permission from the district superintendent or his authorized representative or representatives.

APPENDIX D

TABLE 1

Average Daily Attendance, State Support, and State Support per Unit of Average Daily Attendance; by Type of Student Junior Colleges—1961-62

Item	Defined Adults[1]			Minors[2]			Total
	Resident Students	Non Res. Students	Total	Resident Students	Non Res. Students	Total	
Average Daily Attendance	35,071	6,099	41,170	128,470	31,948	160,418	201,588
State Apportionment							
Basic Aid[3]	$4,383,875	$762,375	$5,146,250	$16,059,750	$3,993,500	$20,052,250	$25,198,500
Equal Aid[4]	$212,024		$212,024	$5,528,095		$5,528,095	$5,740,119
Total	$4,595,899	$762,375	$5,358,274	$21,586,845	$3,993,845	$25,580,345	$30,938,619
Basic Aid per a.d.a.	$125.00	$125.00	$125.00	$125.00	$125.00	$125.00	$125.00
Equal Aid per a.d.a.	$6.05		$5.15	$43.03		$34.46	$28.48
Total Aid per a.d.a.	$131.05	$125.00	$130.15	$168.03	$125.00	$159.46	$153.48

Source: Bureau of School Apportionments and Reports, Dept. of Education.
[1] Ed. Code 6352.
[2] Includes adults taking more than 10 class hours per week.
[3] A.D.A. × $125.
[4] Total apportionment minus Basic Aid.

TABLE 2

Average Daily Attendance, State Support, State Support per Unit of Average Daily Attendance, Current Expense, Current Expense per Average Daily Attendance, With State Support per A.D.A. Expressed as a Percent of Current Expense per A.D.A.—By Type of Class Junior Colleges—1961-62

Item	Total	Resident Students	Non Res. Students	Graded Classes			Non-Graded Classes[1]		
				Resident Students	Non Res. Students	Total	Resident Students	Non Res. Students	Total
"Adult" Average Daily Attendance[2]	41,170	35,071	6,099	37,142	4,019	41,161	7,929	1,180	9,109
"Minor" Average Daily Attendance[3]	160,418	128,470	31,948	127,346	31,800	159,146	1,126	148	1,274
Total a.d.a.	201,588	163,541	38,047	164,488	35,719	191,307	9,055	1,328	10,383
Current Exp. of Ed.	$12,008,670					$11,774,670			$3,784,047
State Apportionment									
State Aid[4]	$25,198,500	$20,442,625	$4,755,875	$19,210,750	$4,599,875	$23,810,625	$1,131,875	$166,000	$1,297,875
Equal Aid	[5]$5,740,119	[5]$5,740,119		[5]5,641,713		5,641,713	[5]98,301		98,301
Total	$30,938,619	$26,182,744	4,755,875	24,852,463	4,599,875	29,452,338	1,230,356	166,000	1,394,356
State Aid per a.d.a.	$125	$125	$125	$125	$129	$125	$125	$125	$125
Equal Aid per a.d.a.	$28.48	$35.10		$34.29		$29.52	$10.85		$9.48
Total State Aid per a.d.a.	$153.48	$160.10	$125	$159.29	$129	$154.52	$135.85	$125	$134.48
Current Exp. per a.d.a.	$304.48	$309.33	$309.33	$309.09	$309.09	$309.09	$304.48	$304.48	$304.48
Total State Aid per a.d.a. as a percent of Current Exp. per a.d.a.	$37.48	$50.07	$39.39	$50.39	$41.67	$37.49	$37.32	$34.39	$36.94

[1] Classes for Adults.
[2] As defined in Ed. Code 6352.
[3] Includes Adults taking more than 10 Class Hours per week.
[4] a.d.a. × $125.
[5] Total Apport. Minus State Aid.
[6] 37,142 Resident Adult a.d.a. × $5.040 (Unit Rate for Res. Adults—Table 1) plus 127,346 Res. Minor a.d.a. × $43.030 (Unit Rate for Res. Minors—Table 1).
[7] 7,929 Res. Adult a.d.a. × $5.040 (Unit Rate—Table 1) plus 1,126 Res. Minor a.d.a. × $43.030 (Unit Rate—Table 1).

APPENDIX E

OFF CAMPUS EXTENSION LOCATIONS [1]

California State Colleges

College	Location	Rental	Administrative Offices	Number of Courses per year (avge.)
San Diego	Imperial Valley[2]	No	No	18
Sacramento	Beale Air Base	No	No	16
Fresno	Fresno	No	No	44
Fresno	Bakersfield[2]	No	No	13
San Francisco	San Francisco	No	Yes	116
San Francisco	Presidio, San Francisco	No	No	22
San Francisco	Hamilton Air Base	No	No	15

[1] Locations where extension courses are offered for full academic year and more than 12 classes.
[2] Off-campus resident centers.
NOTE: A number of colleges report that extension courses are scheduled in high schools, etc. Normally no rental fee is charged and no administrative personnel are located in these facilities.

OFF CAMPUS EXTENSION LOCATIONS

University of California

Northern Area

Location	Rental	Administrative Offices	Number of courses offered (calendar year 1962)
Berkeley	Yes	No	19
Los Altos	Yes	No	23
Oakland	Yes	No	35
Palo Alto	Yes	No	49
Redwood City	Yes	No	13
Sacramento	Yes	No	53
San Francisco	No (University owned)	Yes	345
Sunnyvale	Yes	No	24
Walnut Creek	Yes	No	12

OFF CAMPUS EXTENSION LOCATIONS [1]

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION—SOUTHERN AREA

County	Location	Rent Quarters for Full Academic Year	Administrative Office	No. of Classes Per Year
Los Angeles	Hillstreet Building	yes	yes	345
Los Angeles	Extension Art Studios	yes	no	58
Los Angeles	Western Avenue Building	yes	yes	149
Los Angeles	Burbank	yes	no	23
Los Angeles	Sepulveda	yes	no	77
Los Angeles	Van Nuys	yes	no	24
Los Angeles	Pasadena	yes	no	28
Los Angeles	Rosemead	yes	no	78
Los Angeles	Montebello	yes	no	12
Los Angeles	El Segundo	yes	no	17
Los Angeles	Redondo Beach	yes	no	18
Los Angeles	Torrance	yes	no	58
Los Angeles	Inglewood	yes	no	17
Kern	China Lake	no	yes	39
Orange	Buena Park	yes	yes	210
Orange	Newport Beach	yes	no	14
San Bernardino	Alta Loma	yes	no	22
San Bernardino	Barstow	yes	no	13
San Bernardino	Lake Arrowhead	University owned	yes	149
San Bernardino	Ontario-Upland	yes	no	13
Riverside	Palm Springs-Palm Desert	yes	no	14
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara (downtown)	yes	no	17
Santa Barbara	Santa Maria	yes	no	13
Santa Barbara	Lompoc—Vandenberg Air Force Base	yes	no	13
Ventura	Ventura	yes	no	13
Ventura	Point Mugu	no	yes	20
Ventura	Oxnard	yes	no	13
San Diego	Downtown School Facilities	yes	no	194
San Diego	Downtown Extension Office	yes	yes	13

[1] Locations where University Extension rents quarters for a full academic year and wherein several classes are given and/or administrative offices are located. We have defined several as meaning 12 or more classes per year. There are many other locations where classroom space is rented for a full academic year but where less than 12 courses are offered.
[2] Building used primarily for the Extension Dental Assistant's program. Sometimes other classes are scheduled here as overflow from Hillstreet Building.
[3] Number includes classes only. Center used primarily for conferences.

90430 6-63 3M